George Keith's
FOURTH
NARRATIVE,
OF HIS
PROCEEDINGS
AT
TURNER S-HALL,
1699.

1700
K 28

WE, whoſe Names are under written, having (at Mr. *Keith*'s Requeſt, and by the Allowance of the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of *London*) carefully examin'd the Quotations of this Narrative, do teſtifie the Faithfulneſs of them, and that they exactly agree with the Books out of which they are taken. And as we commend his Integrity, in retracting publickly his Errors, and his Chriſtian Zeal for the reducing of his Brethren who are yet entangled with them; ſo we hope, they will follow his Example, and diſcern the Perniciouſneſs of their Ways, and be led, by the Grace of God, to the Acknowledgment of the Truth, and to the Communion of the Church.

Z. Iſham, D. D. Rector of St. *Botolph Biſhops-gate.*

W. Bedford, D. D. Rector of St. *George Botolph-Lane.*

R. Altham, B. D. Rector of St. *Andrew Underſhaft.*

Will. Whitfield, Rector of St. *Martins* at *Ludgate.*

J. Adams, Rector of St. *Alban*, *Woodſtreet.*

20 5 x 16, 3 cm
(S), 116p

George Keith's
FOURTH
NARRATIVE,
OF HIS
PROCEEDINGS
AT
TURNERS-HALL.

Divided into Three Parts:

Detecting the Quakers Groſs Errors, Vile Hereſies, and Anti-chriſtian Principles, oppugning the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, by clear and evident Proofs (*in above Two Hundred and Fifty Quotations*) faithfully taken out of their Books, and read at three ſeveral Meetings, the 11th, the 18th, and 23d of *Jan.* 1699. before a great Auditory of Judicious Perſons, Miniſters, and others: More particularly diſcovering the Fallacious and Sophiſtical Defences of *George Whitehead*, *Joſeph Wyeth*, and ſeven Quakers of *Colcheſter*, in their late Books on all the ſeveral Heads contained in the printed Advertiſement.

To which is prefix'd, The Atteſtation of five Miniſters of the Church of *England*, to the Truth of the ſaid Quotations;

And a POSTCRIPT.

By GEORGE KEITH.

LONDON:

Printed for *Brabazon Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons* againſt the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*, 1700.

Advertisement.

THIS is to signifie, that it is my purpose (God-willing, and by his Assistance) to be present at *Turners-Hall* in *Philpot-Lane* by *Fanchurch-Street* in *London*, being our ordinary Meeting-place, Licensed by Authority, on the Eleventh Day of the Eleventh Month called *January*, in the Forenoon; there to detect and discover Gross Errors and Anti-christian Principles, plainly repugnant to the Fundamentals of Christianity, in the Books of the approved Authors and Writers of the People called *Quakers*, by ocular Inspection presenting them, in fair and full Quotations, to as many as are willing to be present and make Inspection into them. And also to lay open the great Fallacy and Sophistry of *George Whitehead* and *Joseph Wyeth*, and some of their Brethren at *Colchester*, which they have used in their late printed Defences of their Own, and their Brethrens most Erronious Passages contained in their Books, in order to Cloak and Hide their Antichristian Principles and vile Errors, not only to the great Scandal of all true Protestants in this Nation, of whom they pretend to be the more refined Part, but of all true Christians any where.

And I do hereby desire, *George Whitehead* and *Joseph Wyeth*, and their Brethren of the Second Days Meeting at *London*, who have approved their late Books,

Books, to be present at the said Meeting (for which I have Permission by Civil Authority) or any others who think themselves concerned, at the Time and Place above-mentioned, to hear and see out of their own Books, their Errors and Fallacies detected, who if they have any thing to offer in their own, or Brethrens Defence, shall be fairly heard.

The particular Errors that I intend (God-willing) to discover them guilty of, out of their Books and Authors, are,

Concerning *their Pretences to Infallibility and sinless Perfection.* Concerning *the Scriptures.* Concerning *the Holy Trinity.* Concerning *Christ, his Incarnation, his Soul and Body and Blood, his coming to Judgment at the Last Day.* Concerning *Justification.* Concerning *the Soul.* Concerning *the Light within.* Concerning *the Resurrection.* Concerning *the outward Baptism, and the Supper.* Concerning *doing servile Work on the First Day.*

George Keith.

London, 18*th* 10*th Month*, 1699/1700.

A few Words of

PREFACE

TO THE

IMPARTIAL READERS.

IMpartial Readers, I have theſe few things to acquaint you with, and recommend to your Conſideration.

Firſt, *that I found juſt and neceſſary Cauſe to recite diverſe former Quotations given in my former Narratives, and in other Books formerly publiſh'd againſt the Quakers Errors, to detect the fallacious and ſophiſtical Defences that they have made in their late Books, in Vindication of thoſe Quotations, to cover their vile Errors.*

Secondly, *Beſide the former Quotations above mentioned, I have brought many new Quotations, which are neither in my former Narratives, nor in any other Books that hitherto have been publiſhed againſt them, which obviates the cavelling of the Quakers, who would be ready to ſay,* There is nothing to be expected of new Matter, but what is contained in other Books, and which hath been already anſwered by them: *The contrary whereof will ſufficiently appear to any that ſhall compare this fourth Narrative, with any other Books, before this, publiſhed againſt them.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *Whereas the common Objection of the Quakers, is,* That their Books are neither fully nor fairly quoted: *To remove the Ground of any such Objection, I have got the Atteſtation of Perſons of known Integrity and Judgment, to the Truth of them (as I got the like Atteſtation from ſome, the former Year, to atteſt to my third Narrative.) I have given the Quotations as fully and fairly as is requiſite to ſatisfie any reaſonable Perſons. But the Men I have to deal with, for all this, will (I expect) renew their unjuſt Complaint, and will tell their Readers,* This and the other Paſſage, going before, or following, ſhould have been inſerted in the Quotations; *whereas the not inſerting of them, makes not their Cauſe one whit the worſe, nor the inſerting them, makes their Cauſe one whit the better, as could be ſhewed in many Inſtances, and is ſhewed in their late Books, for when ſo much is quoted out of any Book, that gives the full Senſe of the Writer; whatever is more, is ſuperfluous.*

Note, for a Proof on the laſt Head, That the Quakers deny the Moral Law or Ten Commandments, to be a Rule to the Chriſtian's Life, and thereupon do not blame, but juſtifie doing ſervile Work on the firſt Day, yea, and in the Face of a Congregation, while the Miniſter was preaching. *See p.* 28. *of this Narrative.*

G. K.

George

George Keith's Fourth Narrative,

OF HIS

Proceedings at Turners-Hall, 1699.

For the Detecting the

QUAKERS ERRORS.

The first Part giving an Account of his Proofs on the first four Heads, contained in his printed Advertisement, viz. *Concerning,* I. *Their Infallibility,* II. *Their sinless Perfection,* III. *The Scriptures,* IV. *The Holy Trinity.*

Proofs out of the Quakers Books, on the first Head, concerning their Infallibility.

I. GEORGE *Fox,* Great Mystery, pag. 105. *For who witness these Conditions that they were in, that gave forth the Scriptures? They witness Infallibility, an infallible Spirit, which is now possessed and witnessed among these called Quakers. Glory to the Highest for ever.*

Again, a little after, *So I say, the Devil, false Prophets, Antichrists, Deceivers, Beast, Mother of Harlots; none of these can witness an infallible Spirit. But being out of the Spirit, that Christ, the Prophets and Apostles was in, that gave forth Scriptures, they are not infallible as they were, but with that they are all judged out.*

II. Great Mystery, pag. 98. *And thou and you all that speak and write, and not from God immediately and infallibly, as the Apostles did, and Prophets, and Christ; but only have gotten the Words; you are all under the Curse in another Spirit ravenned from the Spirit that was in the Apostles.* Saul's Errand to Damascus, pag. 7. *They are Conjurers and Diviners, and their Teaching is from Conjuration, which is not spoken from the Mouth of the Lord, and the Lord is against all such, and who are of God are against all such.*

Truth defended, by G. F. and *Rich. Hubb,* p. 104. *Our giving forth Papers or printed Books, it is from the immediate eternal Spirit of God, to the shewing forth the filthy Practices of the World's Teachers,* &c.

George Whitehead, Voice of Wiſdom, pag 33. his Opponent, *Th. Danſon*, having ſaid, *As for our Want of Infallibility, 'tis no valid Plea againſt our Miniſtry. G.W.* anſwers, *His Falſhood here appears plainly, for they that want Infallibility, and have not the Spirit of Chriſt, they are out of the Truth, and are fallible, and their miniſtry is not of the Spirit, ſeeing they ſpeak not from the Spirit, but from their own Hearts, which are deceitful, where they want Infallibility, ſo out of the Abundance of the Heart, the Mouth ſpeaketh.*

Note, *Joſ. Wyeth*, in his *Switch for the Snake*, p. 87. ſtates the Queſtion concerning their Infallibility, fallaciouſly in three ſeveral Particulars.

1. *That the holy Spirit of God is infallible*, &c. This is no Part of the Controverſie.

2. *That the holy Spirit leads all ſuch who obey him, infallibly into all Truth neceſſary to Salvation:* This is wrongly ſtated, the true State of the Queſtion being, Whether the Holy Spirit leads us into all Truth neceſſary to Salvation, without the external Doctrine, externally delivered in the holy Scriptures, by preaching and reading, and without all external means? This they affirm, as ſhall hereafter be proved; but this all ſound Chriſtians deny, who yet grant, that all the Faithful are infallibly led into all Truth neceſſary to Salvation, by the infallible Spirit, in the Uſe of the holy Scriptures, which contain the infallible Truths of the Goſpel.

3. *That the Miniſters who are ſent forth in the Work of the Miniſtry, have, or may have (if they diligently attend to the Voice of the infallible Spirit ſpeaking in them) a certain infallible Knowledge and Aſſurance of the Truth of what they ſo deliver.* This alſo is wrongly ſtated, the true State is not what they have or may have, but what they really have in all they preach and write, as is clear from the above-given Quotations of *G. F.* and *G. W.* their great Leaders. To ſay, they *may* have, implies that they *may* not have, and in that caſe they are fallible, and ſo by their own Verdict, are under the Curſe, Conjurers, Deceivers.

Note, that their great Teachers and Leaders, *G. F.* and *G. W.* have taught, that the infallible teaching of the Spirit, is not by the medium or external Means of the Scriptures, and that Faith is not given by the external Word, doth appear from their Books.

1. *G.F. Gr. Myſt.* pag. 350. *Ye tell People of an outward ordinary means by which Chriſt communicates the Benefit of Redemption. The means of Salvation is not ordinary nor outward, but Chriſt is the Salvation, who is eternal.*

2. *Gr. M.* p. 133. His Opponent, *T. Moor*, having ſaid, *The Scripture is the abſolute Rule and Medium of our Faith.* In pag. 134. he anſwereth, *The Scriptures is not the Author, nor the Means of it*, nor the Rule, *but Chriſt who gives it, and he encreaſeth it.*

3. *Gr. Myſt.* pag. 243. *And the things of the Goſpel, and of the Spirit are not attained by an external means.*

4. *Gr. Myſt.* pag. 320. His Opponents having ſaid, *God works Faith in us inwardly by his Spirit, and outwardly by his Word.* He anſwers, *Here thou goeſt about to make the Spirit and the Word not one; is not the Word Spiritual, and Chriſt called the Word?*

Gr. Myſt. p. 168. *Them that never heard the Scripture outwardly, the Light that every Man hath that cometh into the World, being turned to it, with that they will ſee Chriſt, with that they will know Scripture, with that they will be led out of all Deluſion, come into Covenant with God, with which they will come to worſhip God in the Spirit, and ſerve him.*

Note, the Quakers that ſay, they are turned to the Light, yet are not led out of all Deluſion, but many of them are under great Deluſions and Error, concerning the great Truths of the Goſpel, as doth evidently appear by theſe and the following Quotations.

A Quotation being brought out of Gr. Myſt. in the *Snake of the Graſs*; *Thou caſt not know the Scriptures, but by the ſame Degree of the Spirit that the Prophets and Apoſtles had.* *Joſ. Wyeth* ſaith, in his *Switch*, *By the Error of the Preſs, the Word* ALL *is left out*: For which he quotes Gr. Myſt. pag. 212. G. Myſt. p. 213. Switch. pag. 79.

In anſwer to this, hear what G. F. ſaith in Gr. M. pag. 120. *And he that hath found the true Record, the Spirit of God; with that he ſhall know* ALL *the Scriptures, and is come within the Book where all things are written, and which writes all things forth, the Spirit.*

Note, G. F. no doubt, and G. *W.* did think they had found the true Record, the Spirit, &c. and therefore they knew ALL Scripture, and had the ſame Degree that the Prophets and Apoſtles had. G. F. G. M. p. 222. *The Light*, &c. *is the Subſtance of all Scriptures, opens all Scriptures, and that all Scriptures ends in: Lets ſee all Scripture.*

But that the Quotation of the *Switch*, G. M. p. 212. is lamely made, the following Words prove, that ſome of the Quakers at leaſt did underſtand (as they thought) ALL Scripture. The Paſſage is this; *But they cannot know all Scriptures, but as they attain to the full Meaſure of the Spirit of the Prophets and Apoſtles, and to the Meaſure and Stature, and Fullneſs of Chriſt: And if they do not attain to all this, they are not able to know all the Scriptures, and the Work of the Miniſters of God, was to bring People to this, to the Meaſure, and Stature, and Fullneſs of Chriſt.*

Note, that they thought their Miniſtry had brought ſome of the Quakers to this; we ſhall ſee hereafter, and no doubt they judged they were come to it, *viz.* G. F. and G. *W.* Gr. M. p. 47. *The Light which every one hath that cometh into the World, is ſufficient to Salvation without the Help of any other Means or Diſcovery.*

But which is much more than that of Degrees! G. F. tells of them that were come to that, which is above Degrees.

Gr. Myſt. pag. 281. *And the Blood of the Seed it cleanſeth from Sin, the Power and Stain of it; and then the Guilt is gone of it, and where this is known, the Seed that deſtroys Death, and him that hath the Power of it, which is the Devil; the Fullneſs is known, which is above Degrees, that which Degrees ends in.*

Again, G. Myſt. pag. 318. *For who comes to the Spirit, and to Chriſt, comes to that which is perfect, who comes to the Kingdom of Heaven in them, comes to be perfect, yea, to a perfect Man, and that is above any Degree.*

Note, by this it appears, G. F. thought himſelf, and ſome others of the Quakers, come above any Degree, and that is beyond and above the Apoſtles themſelves, who were but in the Degrees, but they were come to the Fulneſs it ſelf, that is, to be equal with Chriſt himſelf.

But let us next hear G. *Whitehead*'s Excuſe of G. F. Saying, *None can underſtand Scripture, but by the ſame Degree of the Spirit the Prophets and Apoſtles had.*

In his late Book, called *Truth and Innocency*, pag. 19. *But if any true Knowledge of the Scripture be received, that muſt be by a Degree of the ſame Spirit, as I ſuppoſe, the Words before-cited ſhould be ſo tranſpoſed, and ſo intended.*

Note, If this Liberty be allowed, to tranſpoſe Words in a Sentence, the falſeſt Aſſertions may be made true, and the trueſt made falſe, as *Acts* 12. It's ſaid, *Herod* killed *James*, by tranſpoſing *James* killed *Herod*. Is not this a rare Evidence of G. *W*'s Truth and Innocency, or rather of his ſhameful Sophiſtry: But whereas he ſaith, the Words were ſo intended, the above Quotations prove that G. F's Intention was, that ſome of the Quakers, and to be ſure HE for one, were come to the ſame

Degree; yea, which is more, to the Fullneſs, and that is above any Degree.

But it's no wonder *G. F.* thought he was come to ſuch Height of Perfection, when he ſaid in his *Battle-door, All Languages are to me no more than Duſt, who was before Languages were:* This Paſſage *Joſ. Wyeth* quotes lamely, *Switch*, pag. 149. leaving out the Words, which were chiefly offenſive, *who was before Languages were.*

Snake, pag. 85. What ſaith *Joſ. Wyeth* to this? And why did he not fully quote it, as it was objected in the *Snake*? It ſeems he found Difficulty to give a plain Anſwer to it, therefore made a lame Quotation. The like, or rather more blaſphemous Aſſertion is in a Book of *J. Parnel*, called, *The Watcher*, p. 37. *But to the end of all Diſputes and Arguments, I am come; for before they was, I am, and in the Light do them comprehend, and judge to be out of the Light in* Babylon, *&c.*

Switch. p. 453, 465. But here again let us note, that the Author of the *Switch* acts the dull Sophiſter very manifeſtly, when on the one hand he ſeems to be highly pleaſed with the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, in the Point of Inſpiration, and ſaith, *He is glad that ſo eſſential a Truth, as is the Inſpiration of the holy Spirit, is owned by her*: And on the other hand, for blaming the Author of the Snake, for his contradicting himſelf, by his approving the Inſpirations owned by the Church of *England*, and yet faulting the Quakers Pretences to Inſpirations. The Author of the *Snake* had ſufficiently cleared this, in his Book called *the Snake*, &c. pag. 322. what ſort of Inſpiration the Church of *England* owned, *which is that of ſanctifying and ſaving Graces*; but for the extraordinary and miraculous Inſpirations of Prophecy and Tongues, ſhe doth not pretend to, nor teach, that they are commonly given, or that they are to be ſought, there being no need of them.

The manner of prophetical Inſpirations, which the Prophets and Apoſtles had, was ſuch as they had given them by the Spirit, *without all outward teaching of Men or Books*; and beſide this, they had the ordinary Inſpirations of the Spirit (given in the uſe of the external means in God's ordinary way) to wit, the ſanctifying and ſaving Graces of the Spirit inſpired into them. Here is a plain Difference betwixt the Inſpirations which the Quakers pretend to, given them without the external means of hearing, reading, *&c.* and the Inſpirations given in the uſe of the ordinary means of the written Word, both preached and read, that the Church of *England* lays claim unto, which makes the Sophiſtry of the Author of the *Switch* very manifeſt, and alſo his great Injuſtice to the Author of the *Snake*, ſo to charge him without ground.

Switch, pag. 38. But let us hear what great matters the Author of the *Switch* pretends, that the Inſpirations of the Light within, will teach them who attend upon it: *It will* (ſaith he) *fully teach them their Duty to God, and enable them to perform it: It will diſcover to them a Syſtem of Principles truly Orthodox, with more Certainty than Counſel or Synod can, not taught by it; for he is indeed a wonderful Counſeller. It will firſt, fully and truly (beyond any Caſuiſt) ſhew unto Man what is his Sin, and if Man deſpiſe not this Diſcovery, but cloſe with it, it will beget in him a Loathing of his Sin, and then proceed to work in him a Repentance from dead Works, which if unfeigned*, you ſee he is very cautious [but why *If unfeigned?* Can the Light within work any other Repentance but that which is unfeigned?] *It will go on to ſanctifie him; and when Man, by this Light, Spirit, or Grace, is ſanctified; it will then witneſs to his Spirit that he is juſtified; ſo will Man come truly to be redeemed. This* (he ſaith) *in ſhort, is the* Subſtance *of what hath been by us declared, concerning this Divine Light, Chriſt in Man, and which is not more than is witneſſed of it in the Holy Scriptures.*

Note,

Note, By this plain Confeſſion, we ſee what ſort of Syſtem of Divinity the Inſpiration the Quakers plead for, doth, or will give them who attend upon it; to wit, *a Scheme of Deiſm, or refined Paganiſm.* In all this Subſtance of his whole Syſtem, not one word of *Faith in Chriſt*, as he outwardly dyed for our Sins; his being the great Sacrifice for the Remiſſion of our Sins, *by Faith in his Blood outwardly ſhed.* But the Inſpirations of the holy Prophets and Apoſtles taught them this Faith, and the neceſſity of it, as well as of Repentance for the Remiſſion of Sins: And ſeeing the Quakers Inſpiration teacheth them nothing of ſuch a Faith, and the neceſſity of it, it is a plain caſe tho the Quakers pretend to the ſame Inſpirations that the Prophets and Apoſtles had; yet they have them not, nay, nor the ordinary Inſpirations that common true Believers have, in and by the means of the external Doctrine contained in the holy Scriptures, that lead them to regard Chriſt outwardly, as he was crucified and raiſed again, and is at the Right Hand of God, *in our Nature*, as the great Object of their Faith: But this the Inſpirations of the chief Teachers of the Quakers have led them not to regard.

In the whole Syſtem of his Orthodox Principles, the Subſtance whereof he tells us he has given; there is not one *intire Article of the Creed*, commonly called *the Apoſtles Creed*, mentioned; nay, nor ſo much as implyed. And indeed, he cannot (nor any of his Brethren) by any real Evidence, convince any Man, that their Inſpirations have taught them ſo much as *one intire Article of that Creed, in the true Senſe*, generally received *by true Chriſtians*; and according to their Principles, they muſt not ſay, that the Spirit has given or wrought the Faith of the Articles of the Creed in them, by the medium or means of the outward Word; for that is contrary to *G. Fox's* Doctrine above delivered, and as expreſly contrary to the Doctrine of *G. Whitehead*, in his *Brief Diſcovery of the dangerous Principles of* John Horne, *pag.* 18. who blames *J. Horne* and *T. Moor for having affirmed, that the Scriptures are the medium of Faith*, [*i. e.* the means by which Faith is wrought in Believers.] There is no ſuch Scripture (ſaith *G. W.*) as ſaith, the Scriptures are the Medium of Faith. *G. W's.* brief Diſcovery, p. 18.

Note, ſeeing the Quakers have not the Faith of Chriſt, as he was outwardly crucified, and died for our Sins, and roſe again; neither by the Light within them, nor by the medium of the Scriptures, as the Inſtrument of the holy Spirit, as other true Chriſtians have it; it is a plain caſe, they have no Faith of it at all, other than a meer hiſtorical Faith, as they have of any common Hiſtory; and indeed many of them have not that.

G. Whitehead, in his *Quakers Plainneſs*, p. 70. brings a quibbling Diſtinction betwixt a means and the means, he grants, *The Bible may be a means inſtrumentally, as God beſtows a Bleſſing upon, or accompanies the ſerious reading thereof, as it directs to Chriſt Jeſus, or to his Light and Spirit, which openeth the Underſtanding in the holy Scriptures.* And a little before he ſaith, *Mark the Difference betwixt a means and the means, as between the Bible and Chriſt; that may be a means which is not the means, Chriſt being the abſolute way and means, by way of Eminency for Man to come to know God.*

But to ſhew the Fallacy of this Quibble: By the means are generally underſtood the inſtrumental and ſubordinate Cauſes, to the principal Agent and Efficient, which ought not to be confounded. Chriſt is the Author, and principal Efficient of our Knowledge of God; and the Bible, *i. e.* the divine Oracles and Teſtimonies contained therein, are the means, and to ſay the means, or a means, is equivalent among all that know true *Engliſh*; as when we ſay, Food and Raiment are *the*

means

means to preſerve our natural Life, or *a means*; the Senſe is the ſame.

But it is proved already out of G. F's Gr. Myſt. p. 243. that G. F. denyed that the things of the Goſpel, and of the Spirit, are attained by *an external means*; will G. W's Diſtinction here ſerve him? Will he again diſtinguiſh betwixt a means and an external means?

But let us apply this ſubtile Diſtinction of G. W. to the Words of G. F. in *Saul's Errand*, p. 6. who being charged that he ſaid, *He was the eternal Judge of the World*, he confeſſeth it, and brings ſeveral Proofs, as he thinks, to prove it, as that *the ſpiritual Man judgeth all things, and the Saints ſhall judge the World*: Now, ſeeing G. W. will needs have a Diſtinction betwixt *a means* and *the means*, why not alſo betwixt *a Judge of the World*, and *the Judge*, yea, *the eternal Judge of the World*, as he profeſſeth himſelf to be? It was not enough that G. F. ſhould be a Judge of the World, but *the Judge*, yea, the *eternal Judge* of the World; and by G. W's Logick, G. F. was not a Judge, but *the Judge*, by way of Eminency; yea, *the eternal Judge of the World*. But G. F. after his manner of frequently corrupting the Words of Scripture, as well as his Opponents Words, doth corruptly and falſly argue from that Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 6. 2. *Do ye not know that the Saints ſhall judge the World*: Note, the Words, *ſhall judge*, in the future, which G. F. corruptly applyeth to himſelf, in the preſent, or preterit. Tenſe, that he was or is *the Judge*, yea, *the eternal Judge of the World*.

Laſtly, To come yet more cloſely to G. W. himſelf, I will ſhew you how he denyeth the Scriptures to be a means for the Converſion of Jews and Heathens to the true Faith; in *Truth defending the Quakers*, by G. W. *qu.* 35. *pag.* 51. *And what is that the Goſpel muſt be preached to, in the Heathens that will receive it? And whether they that preach to Turks and Heathens, ought to preach out of a Text, and prove their Doctrine by Scripture to them, as the Prieſts do in* England, *yea or nay?*

Note, By this Query, he not only excludes the Scripture from being the means, but a means for converting Turks and Heathens; nor will his common Excuſe of ſaying it was but a Query, help him: This ſort of querying being the ſtrongeſt way of denying or affirming, both in Scripture and all other Writings.

Next let us hear *W. Penn*'s Confeſſion concerning means, in his *Key*, printed, 1699. p. 12. perverſ. 8. *The Quakers aſſert the Spirit of God to be the immediate Teacher, and that there is no other means now to be uſed, as Miniſtry, Ordinances*, &c. He anſwereth, *They never ſpake ſuch Language---for they never denied the uſe of means, but to this Day, from the Beginning, they have been in the uſe of them; but then they are ſuch means as are uſed in the Life and Power of God.*

Note with what preſumptuous Confidence, *W. P.* dareth to ſay, *they never ſpake ſuch Language*, when G. F. their great Apoſtle, had plainly ſaid, as above-quoted, *that the things of the Goſpel are not attained by* AN *external means*: That they have been all along in the uſe of ſome means, as preaching, writing, and reading, is but to ſay, their Practice contradicts their Principles, which is very common to them: But to cover their Error, their way is to miſtate the Queſtion, as *W. P.* doth here, which is not whether outward means can truly profit, without the inward Aid and Aſſiſtance of the Spirit; for this is generally granted that they cannot, which is equivalent to his Phraſe, that the means then only profit when uſed in the Life and Power of God: And in very deed, their holding the Light within every Man ſufficient to Salvation, without any thing elſe, as they do commonly teach, deſtroyeth all neceſſary uſe of outward means; as who ſhould ſay, a Man has that within him, that is ſufficient to carry him to *America* without any thing elſe, as Boat or Ship, ſhould be

underſtood

understood to say, he can walk on the Sea, or flie in the Air to that remote Place.

The next thing in reference to their Infallibility, is their Pretence to the infallible discerning of Mens Hearts, without respect to their Works, good or bad. This is differently stated by them, and wherein we shall find a real Contradiction among them.

G. F. in his Gr. Myst, pag. 89. had said, *Here thou hast shewed, that the Quakers have a Spirit given to them, beyond all the Forefathers (which we do witness) since the Days of the Apostles in the Apostacy; and they can discern who are Saints, who are Devils, and who are Apostates, without speaking ever a VVord, they that be in the Power and the Life of Truth.*

This discerning of Mens Hearts, *G. VVhitehead* had formerly placed upon outward Signs in the Countenances of wicked Men or Women, which he still justifieth in his Antitode pag. 69. —— *Proud and haughty Looks, wanton and scornful Eyes, envious and fallen Countenances are rendred in Scripture, as outward Signs or Marks of such wicked Hearts, which also the Gift of discerning perceiveth, and gives to see many times through such outward mediums.*

Note, *G. VV.* here layeth a great Stress upon outward Signs in the Countenance, which he owneth to be outward mediums, through which the Spirit of discerning perceiveth, and giveth to see Mens Hearts, but yet he will not allow the Scriptures to be the medium of Faith, so preferreth outward Signs in the Countenance to the Scriptures, but then he much throweth down this sort of discerning by Mens Countenances, by saying *many times*, for this leaveth their discerning to be many times fallible; and though the Scripture, and common Experience proveth, that the Countenances of some, openly vicious, and extreamly wicked, are Signs of their wicked Hearts, yet the Scripture giveth no universal Rule in the Case, but giveth us the Command of Christ, *John* 7. 24. *Judge not according to Appearance, but judge righteous Judgment*; and it was said of Christ, *He shall not judge after the Sight of his Eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his Ears.* But *G. VV.* will not take Christ in the case for his Example; but he pleads further, *That the Gift of discerning of Spirits is given to some Members especially* (and still is continued) *in the true Church*, and from which discerning, Satan cannot be hid, however he transforms himself. Here is another minching of their Infallibility of discerning, that *it's given to some Members especially*, but he doth not allow it to all Members; however he seems to plead for all the Ministers having it, for he makes *it an Evidence of great Darkness in his Opponents, to hold, that a Minister that is fallible is in the Spirit, a Minister of Christ, and yet cannot discern another Man's State or Condition, so as to give an infallible Character of him*: And he contends so earnestly for this infallible discerning in the Church, that he saith, *If there must be no discerning of Spirits, no infallible or certain Character to be given of other Men's States or Conditions, by an inward Sense or discerning of Spirits; then Christ's Sheep may follow Strangers, VVolves, Dogs, &c. and so be devoured, contrary to his own Doctrine, and below the Sense and Instinct of the very Sheep, which leads them to shun Dogs and VVolves, when they make at them, whether they bark or howl, or be mute.*

Isaiah 11. 3.

Truth and Inn. p. 12.

Note, By this manner of *G. VV's* arguing, not only the Teachers, but all and every one of the People, if they be Sheep, must have this infallible discerning, whereas he pleads for the Ministers having it, or some Members; so it seems the People must rely on the Ministers discerning *by an implicit Faith*, or if not, be in

danger

danger of perishing: But in plain Contradiction to this Doctrine of *G. W.* who pleads for the infallible discerning of Men's Hearts, to every Minister; let us hear *Jos. Wyeth*, who saith, *Switch*, p. 95. *But though this holy Spirit can discover unto one, the Heart and Thoughts of another, as of* Ananias *to* Peter, Acts 5. *yet as that is not usual, so neither is it necessary, nor is it that which we pretend to*; *nor hath* G. F. *in the fore-quoted Places, pretended to it*, referring to the above-quoted Passage, where he makes this Observation, *Switch*, p. 90. *---Which does very plainly shew, that* G. F. *did not attribute this Knowledge or Discerning to the Quakers or any Man, but to the Power and Life of Truth, where it is manifested.* This Gloss, as it is directly contradictory to G. Fox's Words, which say, *They*, i. e. *the Quakers that be in the Power and Life of Truth can discern*; so to the Words of *G. W.* who doth affirm, That *some of the Members especially have it.*

But both G. F. and *G. W.* hath carried this discerning farther than by the outward medium of Men's Looks and Glances, so that they can know the inward States of their Hearers, without looking to their Faces, *yea, though their Backs be toward them*; and not only what they are at present, but what they have been, and shall be from Eternity to Eternity. For Proof of this,

G. M. p. 229. G. F. Gr. M. quotes his Opponents, saying, *Will a discerning of the Gospel Mysteries prove a Power to discern the State and Condition of Souls, what it shall be to all Eternity.* And after some Words he answers, *And so who are come into the Bishop Christ, they are one Soul, they know the Hand of God, which the Soul lives in, which is the Power, and so knows it from Eternity to Eternity*: And so ye Priests which do not discern the Soul and its State, *to Eternity and from Eternity*; *ye are not in the Mystery of the Gospel, which gives Liberty to it, neither have ye it----And you five Priests have shamed your selves that do not know the Soul from Eternity to Eternity*; and on this horrid Presumption, that they knew the State of Men's Souls from Eternity to Eternity. *Rich. Hubberth* passes this severe Sentence on his Opponent, *Truth's def. pag.* 92. *Thou art ordained of old for Condemnation, and for Perdition among the ungodly apes, and art a Reprobate.* And p. 93. *So here thou art cursed, and cast out eternally.* Note, this was only for his asking What is original Sin? And here he speaks of the several States of the Soul, as when the Soul is in Death, and when it liveth, and God hath Pleasure in it: By which Soul, he must needs understand the Soul of Man, for of the Souls of Men his Opponents did speak.

Next *G. W.* in his *Truth defending the Quakers*, hath gone as far as G. F. with respect to his Infallibility in knowing Men's Hearts.

The Question being put to him in *Truth def.* p. 24. qu. 54. *Do not you, G. W. blaspheamously take to your self an Attribute of God, while you pretend ordinarily to know the Hearts of Men. And tell Mr.* Townsend *of* Norwich, *in the second Page of your* Ishmael, *That the Light of God is departed from his Conscience.* He answers, *I take no Attribute of God to my self, but what God hath given me, by whose Gift I witness that Promise fulfilled in me: ye shall discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not*, Mal. 3. 18.

This arrogant assuming of one of God's Attributes, of knowing Men's Hearts, being objected against him lately, in a printed Sheet, called, *An Account from* Colchester, &c. In another late printed Paper, signed by seven Quakers at *Colchester*, called, *Some Account from* Colchester, they expostulate the Case with them who made the Objection: *Is it such an Error to believe or witness the fulfilling of this plain Promise*, Mal. 3. 18. *How do you then believe in Christ, in whom all the Promises of God*

God are yea and amen? If the contrary good Doctrine for you (our Accusers) to hold, that ye or Christians shall not return, nor discern between the righteous and the wicked? &c. Do you not thereby prove your selves blind, and in Unbelief?

Note, This in *Mal.* 3. 18. or any other Place of Scripture proves not that any Man shall *have one of God's Attributes given them to know Men's Hearts*; which is no where promised, but Christ hath taught us to know Men by their Works and Fruits, and not by his giving them one of God's Attributes whereby to know Men's Hearts; for if they had that, they should be as God himself, to know without regard to the Fruits: But that Place, *Mal.* 3. 18. seems to have a plain *Reference to the Day of Judgment*, wherein the Works of all Men, however secret, shall be made manifest, and yet not by Men's having one of God's Attributes given them even then. And as to G. *W*'s Argument for the necessity of this infallible discerning given to Ministers, otherwise Christ's Sheep may follow Strangers and be destroyed: This Consequence doth not follow; for while they follow the Voice of Christ, that is, *his Doctrine outwardly delivered in the holy Scriptures, and inwardly set home and applied to their Hearts by the holy Spirit, they are safe*; and when they follow not that, but Men of false Pretences, who bring a contrary Doctrine, and yet say, they have the infallible Spirit, as the Followers of G. *W*. and his Brethren do; they are in great Danger of perishing, and though the true Sheep of Christ shall not finally be deceived, nor finally perish, yet they at times may be deceived, and have been deceived by false Teachers, and by none more than such false Teachers, who falsly pretend to the Spirit of Christ, and yet preach contrary to his Doctrine.

But that the Quakers did not only pretend to extraordinary Inspirations of the Spirit, but to miraculous Operations I shall shew you out of G. F's G. M. p. 234. Some of them having asked the Question, *Whether your Baptizers cast out Devils, and drink any deadly thing, and it not hurt you? And whether the House where you meet was ever shaken? And where he did give the Holy Ghost to you?* The Opponent calls this an unlearned Question, to which G. F. replies, *This is to shew that you are not Believers, nor in the Power that the Apostles was in.*

Note, By this it appears they lay claim to the same Power of working Miracles that the Apostles had, as to drink any deadly thing, and it not to hurt them, and that the House where they meet was shaken: I have both heard and seen, that some of the Quakers Bodies were shaken in their Meetings, but I never heard nor saw that the House where they met was shaken.

Note, while I was giving my Proofs out of G. F. and G. *W*. their Books, concerning their high Pretences to an infallible discerning Men's Hearts; a Quaker, called *Samuel Miller*, as I am informed, a Bricklayer, stood upon a Bench, and for a further Confirmation, said with a loud Voice, *George, I had a Vision concerning thee twenty Years ago, that though thou didst preach the Gospel to others, thou thy self should be a Cast-away.* This he gave to corroborate G. F's Pretense of his knowing the State of Men's Souls from Eternity to Eternity: But if his and their bare Affirmation must be received for Truth, without all external Evidence, that I am an Apostate, a Cast-away, what Man, howsoever innocent, can escape their uncharitable Censure? Another Quaker, called *Thomas Kent*, stood up, and would have preached, telling the Auditory, *He felt a Fire or Flame burn in his Breast, he had a Conscientious Concern upon him*; but the People forbidding him to preach, he cried out, *The Quotations were false*, but gave not the least Proof: I told them he has been disowned by the Quakers, and recorded out of the Unity these many Years,

for his Drunkenness, and opposing G. Fox's Orders; so after a short time he was silent.

Proofs out of the Quakers Books on the second Head, concerning their Sinless Perfection.

IT being objected against G. F. that he had said, *He was as upright as Christ*; He answers, *These Words were not so spoken to me, but that as he is, so are we in this present World, that the Saints are made the Righteousness of God, that the Saints are one in the Father and the Son, that we shall be like him,* 1 Joh. 3. 2. *And that all teaching which is given forth by Christ, is to bring the Saints to Perfection, even to the measure of the Stature of the Fullness of Christ; this the Scripture doth witness, and this I witness; where Christ dwells, must he not speak in his Temple?*

Saul's Errand, p. 11.

It having been said by one of G. F's Opponents, *They (i. e.* the Saints) *cannot be perfect here or hereafter in Equality, but only in Quality.* G. F. answers, *Christ makes no Distinction in his Words, but saith, Be ye perfect, even as your Heavenly Father is, and be ye merciful as he is, and as he is so are we, and that which is perfect and merciful, as he is perfect and merciful, is in Equality with the same thing, which is of God and from him.*

G. Myst. p. 282

G. *Whitehead,* in Defence of this Passage, *in Truth and In,* p. 14. saith, *Now where's the Blasphemy pray? Was it not Christ's own Doctrine? Be ye perfect even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect*; and *Luke* 16. 36. *Be ye therefore merciful as your Father is merciful. Now what Distinction doth Christ make in these Words and Precepts, as in point of Purity, and where's the Perfection in Quality granted then, and wherein must this Perfection consist?*

Note, It was not Christ's Doctrine to be perfect in Equality with God's Perfection, for that were to command them to be God himself, and though Christ expresseth no Distinction, yet it is implied; and whereas G. *W.* pleads for the *Saint's Equality with God in point of Purity,* he is still blasphemous; the Saint's Perfection in Quality is not an essential Perfection, for what Holiness and Purity they now have, they formerly had not, but God's Perfection is essential to him, and so is his Purity, his Purity and Perfection is himself, and so is not the Saint's Perfection or Purity, therefore there is an infinite Distance betwixt God's Perfection, and all Creatures Perfection whatsoever.

Again, G. M. p. 197. His Opponent having said, *He sums up all in this, Be ye therefore perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect, that is, in Quality not in Quantity.* G. F. answers, *He that is perfect is perfect, as his Heavenly Father is perfect, is perfect as he is perfect: If thou or any have an Ear to hear, let him hear, and lay away the Qualities and Quantities, and take the Words as they are, and all that are come into Christ, are come into Life from the Dust and Ashes, and are Spiritual Men.*

Note, This he spoke in Opposition to his Opponent his calling Man *poor Dust and Ashes*; here he magnifies himself above *Abraham*, who called himself Dust and Ashes, and yet was come into Christ, and into his Life. The like arrogant Expression he hath in G. M. p. 299. *Such as be Saints through the immortal Seed, are not Dust and Ashes, for the immortal Seed lives and abides and endures for ever.*

G. M. p. 310. *A Tittle of the Law is seen not to be broken, and this (saith he,) is common to*

Who

Who comes to the Kingdom of Heaven in them, comes to be perfect, yea, to a perfect Man, and that is above any Degree. G. M. p. 281, 318.

Again, *Are you not worse than Lawyers and Physicians, taking the Peoples Money, and yet cannot make them perfect Men?* G. M. p. 268.

Note, By this reckoning, all the deceased Quakers were perfect with a sinless Perfection before their Decease, yea, and all they not deceased, by G. F's Doctrine above-quoted, for in all these Places G. F. means a sinless Perfection.

He blames his Opponent for saying, *One that is in the Kingdom of Grace groaning for Adoption.* And p. 218. G. M. *He will not allow any that's translated into the Kingdom, to have any Members to be mortified.*

He judges his Opponents for saying, *That Pollution was in the Church*, and saith, *That the Church is without Spot, or Wrinkle, or Blemish, or any such thing, meaning surely the Quakers Church.*

But that the Quakers Church or Ministry, are not all such, who are without Spot, or Wrinkle, or Blemish, or any such thing. G. *VV's General Epistle* (which he calls, *A Christian Epistle to Friends*, &c.) sufficiently sheweth, in p. 4. He chargeth it *upon too many Professors of Truth* (*viz.* among the Quakers) *their Negligence and Unfaithfulness to Truth in themselves, which hath caused a Decay of Love, and want of Charity towards others, and then instead of humbly waiting and depending upon the Lord, some have exalted themselves in a self-will self-conceit and affection to Preheminence in Judgment over others, until thereby Divisions and false Separations have been caused, and stirred up by them, to the great Grief of the Spirits of the upright: Such were never throughly subjected into true Humility, Mortification, true Self-denyal, or dying with Christ*, &c.

In that called *G. Fox's Canons, or Orders* (so did all that Party of the Quakers call them that joined with *John Story* and *John Wilkinson*, two eminent Preachers of the Quakers, in opposing them) published by G. F. about the Year 1669, and signed or subscribed only by G. F. [Pope-like indeed] having this Title, *Friend's Fellowship must be in the Spirit, and all Friends must know one another in the Spirit and Power of God.* At the Number 9 we have the following Words; *And also all Men that hunt after Women, from Woman to Woman; and also VVomen, whose Affections run sometimes after one Man, and soon after another, and so hold one another in Affection, and so draw out the Affection of one another; and after a while leave one another, and go one from another, do the same thing; these doings make more like* Sodom *than Saints, and is not of God's moving or joining.* And in Number 10. *And Notice be taken of all evil Speakers, Backbiters, and Slanderers, and foolish Talkers, and idle Jesters; for all these corrupt good Manners.* And in Number 11. *All such as are Tale-carriers and Railers, whose VVork is to sow Dissention, are to be reproved and admonished.* And in Number 12. *And all such as go up and down to cheat by borrowing, and getting of Money of Friends in By-places, and have cheated several; all such are to be stopped and judged; as there is a VVoman, tall in her Person, freckled in her Face; and also one* John Harding, *who are for Judgment and to be condemned.* And in the Conclusion he sharply reproves them of the Quaker's Society, *who sit nodding in a Meeting, for their Sleeping, and Sottishness, and Dullness*; and he saith, *Therefore be careful and watchful, and let it be amended.* And last of all he adds, *Let this be read in all your Meetings.*

On this I noted, that these and other Faults he chargeth upon many of his Brethren, owned to be Quakers, evidently prove their visible Church and Society are not such a Church of Christ, which he saith, is *without Spot or VVrinkle*, as above-

 quoted;

quoted; and that as a People, they are far from that sinless Perfection they commonly boast of, on which account they are not known, as a People to pray in their publick Meetings for Pardon of Sin; and yet, where such Faults are, were they sincere, they would both confess and ask Pardon of God for their Sins. I noted also, that according to this Injunction, these Orders or Canons of G. F. are duly read in their quarterly Meetings, both here in *Europe*, and also in *America*, whereof I have been an Eye and Ear Witness. But as he hath not in all his Canons enjoined the reading the holy Scriptures, nor any Part of them in their Meetings; so I said, I never heard any Part of Scripture read in any of their publick Meetings, either for Worship or Discipline; and they cast great Blame on me, for my reading some Texts of Scripture in our Meetings at Turners-Hall. But let it be further noted, that seeing G. F. and G. *W.* have so strongly affirmed, That the Quakers can give an infallible Character of Men, to know who are Saints or Devils, without ever speaking a Word; what need had G. F. in his Canons, to give such a Description of some, by Name and Face, whereby to know them to be Cheats? Surely if they had such an infallible discerning as they pretend, they need not to have such outward Characters of Deceivers.

Note, Were not some of these above-mentioned, Members of the Quaker's Church? and are not such Evils as he has mentioned, that were among them, Spots, and Blemishes, and Sins? Yea, G. *W.* doth own, in his *Voice of Wisdom*, p. 17. before that State of Freedom [from Sin] be witnessed, *There is a Time of Pain in Travel, and of suffering in Temptations and Tryals.* Note, do none of these belong to the Church, who yet have not arrived to a sinless Perfection, but are in that Time of Travel? But what if they die in that Time of Travel, before a sinless Perfection be attained? G. *W.* has passed a most severe and uncharitable Censure on them, *Voice of Wisdom*, p. 42, 43. *This sinless Perfection* (for that's the true State of the Question) *all must come to witness who ever come to be saved, for there is no unclean thing must enter into Christ's Kingdom, therefore People must either expect Freedom from Sin in this Life, or never.*

Note, Thus he has passed a most uncharitable and cruel Sentence, not only upon many who were in a sincere Travel towards Perfection, and yet have not attained to a sinless Perfection before their Decease, but also upon his deceased Brethren, many of whom deceased (as I judge he must confess,) while they were in the Travel towards it, for Quakers commonly are not longer lived than other Men, they die at all Ages, young as well as old, and many die that are but Novices in their Way. And certainly G. *Fox*, and *E. Burr. Fr. Hougel, Rich. Hubb.* and some of their greatest Saints lived in great Ignorance, Error, and Unbelief, in divers great Fundamentals of the Christian Faith, and in great Uncharitableness towards such as differed from them, and remained in these Sins to their dying Day; shall we therefore be so uncharitable to them, as G. *W.*'s Doctrine is, to conclude *they are all damned, and perished eternally*? God forbid, we will be more charitable to them than his Doctrine alloweth.

But then again, in Contradiction, not only to G. F. but himself, he pleads in his *Voice of Wisdom, That the Believers Works are perfect, and God hath wrought all their Works in them*, citing *Isa.* 26. 12. *So these Works of God, which true Believers witness, are perfect, and the Believers have ceased from their own Works, which were imperfect, and are come into God's Works, which are perfect.* But then, what saith he concerning them who are in the Travel towards Perfection? Are not they Believers; Have they no Faith? Thus their Confusion is evident.

They

They do not consider, that though the Work of Faith, Labour of Love, and Patience of Hope in Believers are the Works of God, yet they are also the Works of those Men, in whom they are wrought; it's they who believe, who love and hope by God's Operation or working in them, and therefore they being imperfect, though God is a perfect Being and Agent, their Faith, Love and Hope are imperfect, it being the Property of all Effects to be according to the weaker and more imperfect Causes, according to that true Maxim, *Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quolibet defectu*, a perfect Effect must have all its Causes perfect.

But whatever Charity we may suppose they may have for their deceased Brethren, they have little or none for any such who do not believe to the Hight of their Doctrine of a sinless Perfection before Death; their Doctrine obligeth them to judge, that none of other Societies are saved, because they do not believe the Quakers Doctrine of Perfection before they die, the contrary of which, they call *the Doctrine of Devils*, the which, if any die, and do not renounce before their Decease, by the Quakers Principle, they cannot be saved.

But some of them now begin to go into the same Road with others of other Professions, and after a large Circumference, wherein they have far departed from them who say, *That the Souls of Believers are at the instant of Death made perfect in Holiness*; yet return and say the same thing concerning their imperfect Brethren who are deceased, and yet before their Decease, arrived not to a sinless Perfection; which, if it may be allowed to imperfect Quakers, may be as well allowed to others, sincere Travellers towards Perfection, many of whom, no doubt, have arrived to greater Perfection before their Decease, than any among the Quakers Worthies, of whose Perfection they so much boast, who lived in great Error and Unbelief in the great Fundamentals of Christianity, and Uncharitableness towards others, and of whose Repentance for the same we never heard any Account.

Again, G. F. in his G. M. p. 251. in Defence of his and his Brethrens sinless Perfection, thus answers to that in *Eccles.* 7. 20. *There is not a just Man upon the Earth which doth good and sinneth not. This just, this wise Man upon the Earth, which doth good and sinneth not, that was the Estate of the Law, which Christ is the End of, who is a greater than* Solomon, *who is the just, and Righteousness it self, and makes Men free from Sin.*

Note, that G. F. in Contradiction to his own Gloss, in the same Page, to prove a sinless Perfection, brings the Examples of *Job* and *David*, both which were long before Christ came; and to prove *David*'s sinless Perfection, he brings *David*'s Words; and *David* said, *He had seen the End of all Perfection.* Is not this a rare Proof for a sinless Perfection? But if G. F. did not mean Christ without, but Christ within, to be the End of the Law: As this is a false Gloss on *Paul*'s Words, so that imports, that *Solomon* was not come to the Light within him, which G. F. calls Christ within; but how then could *Solomon* pen such Books of the Scripture, which the Quakers confess to have been writ by Divine Inspiration, if *Solomon* had not come to the Light within him?

But let us hear another as nonsensical Gloss of G. *W.* on the same Place, *Voice of Wisd.* p. 18. *Eccles.* 7. 20. Ans. *The Conversation of the Saints is in Heaven*, Eph. 2. 6. Philip. 3. 20. *And they are redeemed from the Earth and from the Vanity, where* Solomon *saw all things in the Days of his Vanity, in which all were Sinners.*

Note, Is this any Proof, that the Saints, such as *Paul*, who writ these Words, were not real Men upon Earth? And is not G. W. a Man upon Earth so long as he eats, drinks, sleeps, &c? Thus we see how they pervert the Scriptures to prove

their

their sinless Perfection; for if G. W. will own he is one of these just Men on Earth, that *Solomon* writes of, he must confess himself to be a Sinner, if he will not own himself to be a just Man upon the Earth, yet he must allow his Body to be upon Earth, unless he will say, our Sight deceives us when we see him in the Streets, and then either his Body is no Part of him, or if it be, it hath Sin, and consequently, he also hath Sin, if he will own his Body to be a Part of him.

But let us yet again hear another nonsensical Gloss of G. F. to maintain his and his Brethrens sinless Perfection on the Words of *James*, *In many things we offend all*, G. M. p 309. *Mark*, saith G. F. *In the many things we offend all, but we are come to the one thing, Christ Jesus, the End of the many things, and in him there is no Sin, and who is in him sins not, who put an End to the many things that must end and change.* Thus we see his and his Brethrens Presumption, who plainly declare they were got beyond *James*, and all the Faithful to whom he wrote those Words; and he chargeth both *James* and all the Faithful, to whom he wrote all these Words, with a horrid Falshood, that they were not come to the one thing, to wit, to Jesus Christ: And if none are come to Christ or in Christ, but who are perfect with a sinless Perfection, as G. W. doth here argue, then young Believers and Converts, who are travelling towards Perfection, are not in Christ, nor come to Christ, because they have not that sinless Perfection, which is both a most false and most comfortless Doctrine, and injurious to all young Christian Converts at least, and may be thought, by young Quaker Converts, injurious to them also.

Note, while the Proofs were reading out of the Quakers Books for their sinless Perfection, a Quaker (supposed to be *John Whiting*) said, George, *if Men are not perfect before Death, when are they made perfect? It must be either before Death or after Death.* I answered, In the instant of Death, and that is neither before Death nor after Death; as if one should ask, when did *Peter* and other deceased Saints put off the earthly Tabernacle, whether before Death or after Death? The Answer is, neither before nor after, but at the Instant of Death.

But let us hear yet somewhat more of G. F's great Conceit of his and his Brethrens Perfection, even in Equality with God himself.

G. W's brief Discovery, p. 15.

A brief Discovery of the Threefold State of Antichrist, printed 1653. he being charged with saying, *That he was as upright as Christ*; he answers, *these Words were not spoken by me, but that, as he is, so are we in this World, that the Saints are made the Righteousness of God, that the Saints are one in the Father and the Son, that we shall be like him, and that all teaching which is given forth by Jesus Christ, is to bring up the Hearers to Perfection, even to the Measure, Stature, and Fullness of Christ, this the Scripture witnesseth, and I witness fulfilled in me.*

Note, this is more than what is in *Saul's Errand* above-quoted, for there the Words of Scripture are kept to, that mention the Measure of the Stature of the Fullness, but here it's far beyond what is written in Scripture, that he was come, not only to the Measure, but *to the Stature and Fullness of Christ*, and what is this but to be equal with Christ and God? Saul's Errand, p. 13. G. F. *He that is perfectly holy, is perfectly just; where this is revealed, there needs no Addition, for the Man of God is perfect.*

This will yet more fully appear by the following Quotations.

In *Truth def.* by G. *Fox* and *R. Hubb.* page 65. a Query being proposed by the Opponent, *Who is like to be the Man thou speakest of, he that saith he is equal with God and Christ, or he that preacheth Christ the Head?* The Answer is, *Here in this Question thou*

thou openly shewed thy self, not to have the Mind the Apostles had, for (saith he) *I would the same Mind were in you, that was also in Christ Jesus, who thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, and yet made himself of no Reputation,* Philip. 2. 5. *And here thou hast shewed thy self, that thou hast neither the Mind of Christ nor his Apostles, but art an Antichrist, and an Enemy against them that witness these things, which the Apostle said, I would that ye were of the same Mind.* And again the Apostle saith, *Our Fellowship is with the Father and the Son,* 1 Joh. 1. 3.

Again, in his G. *Mystery*, p. 248. he quotes, (but very lamely and corruptly) C. *Wade*, in his Book, Quakery Slain, *He denies the Son of God to be revealed in Man only by Adoption, and cries against Equality with the Father.*

Here before I give you G. F's Answer, I shall give you C. *Wade*'s Words, as they stand in his Book, to which he answers.

C. *Wade*'s Words in his *Quakery slain*, are these, p. 23. G. *Fox*, in the 8. pag. of *Saul's Errand*, affirmeth, *That he that hath the same Spirit that raised up Jesus Christ, is equal with God, and the Saints have the same Spirit in Measure, for God's Spirit is but one.* And G. *Fox* saith, in pag. 11. *That he is a Saint.* ' Thus he would again ' prove, That he, a poor wicked Creature, is equal with God the Creator, and if ' so, then G. *Fox* is the Creator of G. *Fox*, and the whole World ; and he intimate- ' ly claimeth Christ's Equality with God, by his perverted citing of *Philip.* 2. 6, 7. Now in Opposition to G. F's affirming, *He was equal with God*, C. *Wade*, in his pag 24. saith, ' The Scripture saith, that even the Saints themselves are not God's ' Sons otherwise but by Adoption only by Christ (note that you Quakers) not as ' being Christ, as you foolishly fancy but by Christ, for it's written, *Having predesti-* ' *nated us unto the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ*, Eph. 1. 5. See this confirmed, ' *Gal.* 4. 5. *Rom.* 8. 23. and Creature adopted Sons cannot be equal with their Hea- ' venly uncreated Father, who vouchsafeth by free Grace, by and in his Son Christ, ' to adopt them to be his Sons in Acceptation only : Neither can any Creature adop- ' ted Sons, be equal with God's only begotten Son, the Creator of all adopted Sons, ' and all other things, both in Heaven and in Earth also. This is the true and full Quotation out of C. *Wade* his *Quakery slain.*

In Opposition to which sound Doctrine of C. *Wade*, G. Fox thus answers. G. M. p. 248.

Ans. *And that is contrary to the Apostle, who had the Son of God revealed in him, and the Assembly of Divines gave forth a Catechism, which, Children, old and young, was to learn, and said,* The Holy Ghost and Son was equal in Substance and Power and Glory with the Father : *What? Then all that have the Son and the Holy Ghost, hath that which is equal in Power and Glory with the Father.* In this thou hast not only judged thy self, but all the Assembly of Divines at *Westminster*, 1649.

Note, G. *Fox* here doth not quote the Page of C. *Wade*'s Book, as frequently he doth not throughout his G. Myst. give his Opponents Pages of their Books, which it seems was in Design, that his unfair Quotations might not be so easily found out. Now observe, whereas G. F. brings C. *Wade*, *crying against Equality with the Father*, we see by the Quotation given, what Equality with the Father C. *Wade* cries against, to wit, not the Equality of Christ, the only begotten of God, with the Father, for that he expressly affirms by saying, *That Christ, God's only begotten Son, is the Creator of all things* ; but the Equality that C. *Wade* cryed against, was the *Equality of* G. Fox, and *Creature adopted Sons with the Father*, and for his so saying, G. *Fox* makes him to have contradicted the Apostle, and also the Assembly of Divines at *Westminster*, and judged both himself and them.

This

This I think ſo evident a Proof, that G. F. thought himſelf equal with the Father, that neither G. W. nor *Joſ. Wyeth*, nor any of their Brethren, with all their little Craft and Sophiſtry, can clear this Paſſage from that downright Blaſphemy, That G. F. was equal with God, for neither the Aſſembly of Divines at *Weſtminſter*, nor C. W. deny the Equality of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt, for G. *Fox* grants they owned it; but the Equality which C. *Wade* cryed againſt, was the Equality of G. F. or any of the Saints with the Father. But here we find the Strength of G. *Fox*'s Logick, The Son and Holy Ghoſt are equal with the Father, therefore G. F. is equal with the Father, the Proof of which Conſequence muſt be one of theſe two following Aſſertions; the one is, That G. *Fox* thought himſelf to be the Son of God, or ſuch a Son as was equal with the Father; the other is, That becauſe the Son of God was revealed in G. *Fox* (as he thought) that therefore G. *Fox* was equal with the Father. As to the firſt of theſe Aſſertions, as it is utterly falſe, that G. *Fox* was the Son of God, to wit, the only begotten Son of God, the Word made Fleſh, ſo the other is utterly a falſe Conſequence, that becauſe the Son of God was revealed in him, that therefore he was equal with the Father; but ſurely, if the Son of God had been revealed in him, that Revelation would have taught him not to utter ſuch horrid Blaſphemy.

But that C. *Wade* did not deny, but own as much as the Scripture warranteth, That God the Father, as alſo Chriſt the Son, were manifeſted or revealed in the Saints: I ſhall quote a Paſſage in his Book, being originally the Words of one *T. Moor*, that wrote againſt the Quakers, whom *J. Nailer* had charged, *That he would exclude God and Chriſt out of the World, and that he ſhould no more dwell in his People till Doomſday*: In Oppoſition to which, C. *Wade* quotes the following ſaying of *T. Moor*, which he approves, pag. 23. of *Quakery ſlain*, *That the Majeſty of God, whoſe Throne is in Heaven, is in his Inſpections, Influences, and Operation every where; and in his gracious and ſpiritual Preſence, and manifeſted Nighneſs in and through his Son, dwelling in* Sion, *even in the Hearts and Societies of his People.*

Now let us hear what *Joſ. Wyeth* and G. *Whitehead* ſay in Defence of that blaſphemous Paſſage above-mentioned, quoted from *Saul*'s Errand to *Damaſcus*, p. 8. *He that hath the ſame Spirit that raiſed up Jeſus from the dead, is equal with God.* Switch, pag. 59. *Joſ. Wyeth* doth plainly juſtifie it by the like falſe Conſequence as G. *Fox* made; he ſaith, *For when Men are guided by the Holy Spirit, they are certainly guided by God, for the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are one God, and therefore equal, and that which is equal, as* G. *Fox* (he ſaith) *often expreſſeth it.* But doth it therefore follow, that becauſe the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt are equal, that therefore he that hath either the Son or the Holy Ghoſt, is equal, either with the Son, or Holy Ghoſt, or with the Father? yet this is *Joſ. Wyeth*'s blaſphemous Conſequence, to juſtifie G. F's Blaſphemy.

But G. W. hath found two other Ways to defend the above-ſaid Blaſphemy of G. F. in the *Supplement to the Switch*, he ſaith, p. 328. *And if any among us have writ of them who are perfect in Chriſt Jeſus, being led by his Spirit, as in that Senſe equal, I underſtand equal only as like unto God, or in Union with him, being united unto him by his Spirit, as he that is joyned to the Lord is one Spirit.*

Note firſt, The Word *Equal*, no where that I know, either in Scripture, or other Books, or common Speech in any Language, ſignifieth only *as like*, therefore this is a meer Force put upon the Word, and a ſtrained Senſe: But Secondly, That could not be the Senſe intended by G. *Fox*, becauſe, as I have above ſhewed in a former

Quo-

Quotation, he proves that he is equal with God the Father, becauſe the Son and Holy Ghoſt are equal with the Father. Now will G. W. ſay, That the Equality betwixt the Son and the Holy Ghoſt and the Father, is only an Equality of Likeneſs, as to ſay, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are only like the Father, but are not really equal with the Father: This was the Arian Hereſie, that the Son was like the Father, but not equal or of the ſame Subſtance with the Father; they ſaid he was *Homoiuſios*, but not *Homouſios*.

But he hath yet another String to his Bow, in his Truth and Innocency, pag. 10. *Therefore the Words* [He that hath] *in the ſaid Inſtance, ſhould be left out, being contrary to* G. F's *and our Principle, and to his own very Words and Confeſſion a little before in the ſame Book, quoting* Saul's Errand, p. 5, 6. where G. F. ſaith, *It was not ſo ſpoken, as* G. Fox *was equal with God, but the Father and the Son is one.* But the Fallacy lyeth here, he did not ſay *George Fox*, to wit, the Name *George Fox*, or the outward viſible Body that bears that Carnal Name, as he ſomewhere calls it, but the new Name that he hath, that is the *He* that is equal with God, becauſe that *He* is the Son, and as to what G. *W.* ſaith of Union with God, that G. F. did not mean Union by Faith and Love, but a perſonal Union, appears from G. M. p. 100. He brings in his Opponent ſaying, *God dwells not in the Saints as a* Perſonal Union. In Oppoſition to which he anſwers, *How comes the Saints then to eat of his Fleſh, and to be of his Fleſh and Bone:* Note, it ſhould be by a perſonal Union? *And God dwelling in them, and have Unity with the Son and the* Father, *and to be of his Body which is the Church, and Chriſt the Head*: Yea, he blames his Opponent, G. M. p. 258. for ſaying, *To ſay that God is ſubſtantially in Man, as eſſentially one with him, can be no other but the Man of Sin.*

But whereas G. *W.* ſaith, *He that hath* ſhould be left out; pray who put them in? That they were G. *Fox's* Words, the Book called *Saul's Errand*, affirms, if this Liberty be allowed to tranſpoſe, leave out, and add Words in a Sentence, nothing ſo vile and blaſphemous or atheiſtical, but may be juſtified by G. *W.* who hath uſed all theſe three Methods to defend his and his Brethrens vile Errors.

But let us hear one Paſſage more of G. F. out of G. Myſt. p. 299. to let us know what Conceit he had of himſelf as being more than a Creature; he tells, *That one had raiſed a grievous Lye againſt* G. F. *and ſaid, he ſaid he was Chriſt*, p. 298. to the End. This Man having ſo charged him, and having told him he had Witneſs to prove it, G. F. told him, *He was a* Judas, *and he went away, and after a while hanged himſelf, and Chriſt in the Male and in the* Female, *if he ſpeak he was Chriſt the Seed, and the Seed was Chriſt, but he did not ſpeak it as a Creature.*

Note, he grants he ſpoke the Words, *That he was Chriſt*, but he did not ſpeak it as a Creature, therefore he thought he was ſomething more than a Creature, the Seed in him ſpoke it, which was Chriſt, and that was not a Creature, but what Seed was in him, or in other Quakers, that was not a Creature; I cannot find out any other in his Writings, but his Soul or inviſible Part that he makes to be Chriſt and a Part of God, as will afterwards appear on a diſtinct Head.

But he has yet annother Defence to ſave the like blaſphemous Saying of F. *Howgel, They that have the Spirit of God are equal with God in Nature, but not in Stature.*

It having been objected againſt the Quakers, that ſome of them have ſaid, *They that have the Spirit of God are equal with God:* To this F. *Howgel* anſwers, after ſome foregoing Words, *He that is born from above is the Son of God, and he ſaid,* I and my Father are one; *and where the Son is revealed and ſpeaks, the Father ſpeaks in him,* F. Howgel's Col. p. 232.

him, and dwells in him, and he in the Father; there is Equality in Nature though not in Stature. Here it is a plain Case that F. *H.* places this Equality in Nature but not in Stature, betwixt him that has the Spirit of God, who is born from above, and God himself; for to place it betwixt Christ, as he was the Son of God before all Ages, and God the Father, were to say, That the Son is equal with the Father in Nature but not in Stature, which has a twofold Error in it; first, To make a Distinction betwixt God's Nature and Stature. Secondly, Suppose that Distinction, That the Son is equal to the Father in Nature but not in Stature, both which are most gross and blasphemous, and no less gross and blasphemous it is to affirm, That the Saints are equal with God in Nature but not in Stature.

Now let us hear G. *Whitehead's* Defence, Truth and Inn, p. 10. *The Equality in Nature* (objected) relates to the Divine Nature which the Child of God partakes of in Measure, *though not in Stature*, relates to the Child, that Divine Nature is one and unchangeable, but our participating of it, and Growth in it is gradual, until all (*i. e.* Christ's whole Church and Body) come into the Measure of the Stature of the Fullness of Christ. But doth all this Saying of G. *W.* prove that the Children of God are equal with God, either in Nature or Stature? The Saints are said in Scripture to be Partakers of the Holy Ghost, are they therefore equal to the Holy Ghost? Which yet is the Way of G. *W*'s reasoning; the Equality in Nature he says, relates to the Divine Nature, but who is it that is equal to God in the Divine Nature, but not in Stature? was it the Son or Holy Ghost that is equal to God in the Divine Nature but not in Stature? Nay, therefore it must be the Saints or Believers; here a Proposition is framed, *They that have the Spirit of God are equal with God*; and then this Distinction is given; They are equal in *Nature*, but not in *Stature*: This Proposition hath for its Subject *They*, i. e. *the Saints* or *Children of God*. In all Propositions, all the Parts of the Predicate belong to one and the same Subject, the which Parts are equal in Nature but not in Stature: But it is an unaccountable Liberty that G. *W.* takes in his Way of defending these Blasphemies, not only to change the Signification of Words from all common Use, but the unalterable Rules of right Reason, as in the present Case; like as if one should say, G. *Whitehead* is equal to *A. B.* in Nature but not in Stature; Nature relates to G. W. but not in Stature relates to another; but who is this other who can tell? Or as if one should say G. W. is a Man, but not honest, *Man* relates to G. *Whitehead*, but *not honest* relates to another. It is a real Shame that such pittiful Sophistry should be used by G. W. to defend his and his Brethrens vile Errors and Blasphemies, whereby he makes himself guilty of them, and all to save his and their pretended Infallibility: It were much more Manly, as well as Christian, fairly to acknowledge and retract those most erronious Passages, and own their Fallibility and Error, and be contented to be listed among fallible Men, for *humanum est errare, labi, decipi*; and not only so, but to be greatly humbled for the Presumption, that being Men, they should equal themselves to God.

But the general Conceit of their sinless Perfection, as they are a Body of People, is such, that both G. *W.* and *Jos. Wyeth* doth justifie *W. P*'s objecting to the Church of *England*, their praying from seven to seventy, *Lord be merciful to us miserable Sinners.*

G. *W.* saith, in *Truth and In.* p. 15. *Alas poor Sinners! Is not a Sign of Laughter at him, but rather of Lamentation and Pity over their miserable Estate, who are always crying but not forsaking their Sins.* The like Answer doth *J. Wyeth* give in the Note,

Note, Is not this a plain Evidence of the great Pride that is among the Quakers concerning their sinless Perfection; As a Body of People, and their great Uncharitableness towards, not only the Church of *England*, but all others called Christians throughout the whole World; yea, all Christians in all Ages, and the universal Church of God, both under the old and new Testament, who always used Confession of Sin, and prayed for Forgiveness of Sin? and as Christ taught his Disciples to pray daily for their daily Bread; so to pray daily for Forgiveness of Sins: So under the old Testament there were daily Offerings for Sin, and the High Priest, however so holy, yet offered both for his own Sins, and the Sins of the People: Doth it therefore follow that their Confessions and Offerings were hypocritical?

But doth not *G. W.* know, that as there is a gradual going unto Perfection, so there is a gradual forsaking of Sin, and a putting off the old Man with his Deeds? Must not they who feel themselves wounded with Sin, seek for a Cure? And should not the diseased come daily to the Phisician till they be cured? And as to the Quakers Uncharitableness, and *G. W.*'s especially, towards all in the Church of *England*, whom he chargeth without Exception, that they are still confessing but not forsaking their Sins. How can he more prove this Charge against them than his own Society or himself? Many, both in the Church of *England*, and other Protestants, can compare with the best of the Quakers for Holiness of Life, and exceed them in many Virtues, especially in Humility. But do no not they better who confess their Sins, and yet through humane Frailty, find that they relapse into some Sins, than such proud Pharisees among the Quakers, who neither confess nor forsake their Sins? such as their sinful Ignorance and Errors in the great Fundamentals of the Christian Faith, their too high Esteem of themselves, and Uncharitableness towards others, calling all others but themselves, The World and Idolaters, and their Worship Idolatry: And if any, formerly among them, come to a more sober Mind, and to a more sound Understanding and Faith in Christian Doctrine, and are more charitable towards others: They call them Apostates, as they do call me and others, whom God in his great Mercy has of late recovered from the Errors and Uncharitableness that were and are among them; so that for owning the Protestant Churches, and that we can join in the Worship of God with them, we are rendred Apostates by *G. W.* and his Brethren in their printed Pamphlets against us: But if we be Apostates for this, then by *G. W.*'s and his Brethrens Sentence, all the Protestant Churches are Infidels and Idolaters.

But if the Church of the Quakers be a sinless Church, that need not to confess their Sins, nor pray for Forgiveness of their Sins, how doth this agree with the large Acknowledgments that *G. W.* has made in his *Christian Epistle to the People called Quakers*, of so many things amiss among them, as above quoted? Either such faulty Persons are owned Members of their Church, or they are not; if they are not, why do not they disown them, and excommunicate them, or declare them to be none of them.

If they own them to be of their Church, then their Church is not without Spot, Wrinkle, or Blemish; and consequently, not the Church of Christ by *G. F.*'s Doctrine? If it be said, The Tares cannot be discerned ofs times from the Wheat, then where's their Spirit of discerning, whereby they can know who are Saints or Devils without speaking ever a Word? Surely if they have such a Spirit of discerning, their Sin is great to suffer such a Mixture among them, as *G. W.* complains of in his *Christian Epistle*, especially now that they reckon Enoch's Prophecy is fulfilled in them:

Truth and them: *They, i. e.* the Quakers, *are the ten thousand of his Saints in whom the Lord is*
Jun. p. 13 *come to execute Judgment upon all.* Why do they not begin at home, and first cleanse their own House, and purge out the old Leaven from among them? How is it that diverse unclean Persons, even of their Ministry, have been owned to preach among them while living in secret Uncleanness, diverse of whose Names they know I can produce? Why did they not discern them, seeing they have (as they pretend) an infallible discerning of Mens Hearts? Or if they did discern them, why did they not discover them, and get them cast out of the Camp?

As to the Instance above given of the daily Sacrifices for Sin, which were offered under the Law: If it be replyed, That they grant the Law made nothing perfect, but now a sinless Perfection is brought in by the Gospel. I ask them what became of them all of that ancient Church (who daily confessed their Sins, and prayed for Forgiveness) when they died? Did they die in their Sins! Or where were they cleansed from their Sins after Death? Or did they all perish, according to *G. W's* manner of reasoning against his Opponents in his *Voice of Wisdom* above quoted.

As to that Place in Scripture, *The Law made nothing perfect*; and other the like Places; they are to be understood, first, Comparatively, the Gospel State under the New Testament, as to the general, is a State of more Purity and greater Perfection than the State of the People under the Law. Secondly, The ceremonial Part of the Law, as Circumcision and the Sacrifices, did neither in whole, nor in part, give them the Remission of their Sins, but were Types of Christ, that alone Sacrifice, by which Remission of Sin and Sanctification both then was and now is obtained.

It is on the Conceit that the Quakers have of their sinless Perfection, especially their Ministers, that they are not known to pray for the Forgiveness of their Sins, in their publick Meetings, which gave occasion to that Question in *Truth defending the Quak.* by *G.W.* p. 8. Q. 11. *Do not you think it needless to pray for the Pardon of your Sins?* To this *G. Whitehead* replies, *We have prayed for the Pardon of our Sins, and the Lord, who heard our Prayers, hath pardoned and remitted our Sins, by the Power of the World to come, which we have tasted, and do taste of, as many witness.* But of late some of them have got a way to pray in the third Person plural in their Meetings, as I have observed; as thus, *If any here have sinned against thee, give them Repentance and Forgiveness*: Or thus, *Pardon them that have sinned against thee*: Thus I have heard *John Field* pray, but I never heard him, or any here in *England*, to the best of my Remembrance, pray in the first Person plural, *Forgive us our Sins*; though *Daniel*, and the best of the holy Men recorded in Scripture, prayed, *Forgive us our Sins.* A Quaker said, *George, dost not thou know, that it is the manner of Friends, if any have done amiss, to deal with them, and get them to confess and ask Forgiveness*: I said, that was but as to particular Persons, and private Offences; but that was no Proof as to their general Confession and praying for Pardon of Sin. Another Quaker stood on a Bench, and began to read a Passage out of a Book of mine, called, *The Way cast up*, printed in the Year 1677, containing some Words of Prayer, which I said I had heard, or Words to that effect, used in our Meetings, both to God the Father, in the Name of Jesus Christ, and also to Jesus Christ, naming him by the Name Son of *David.* This Passage that Quaker brought (his Name, as I am informed, is *John Whiting*) to prove, that the Quakers prayed for Forgiveness of Sin, for I was then a Quaker, but what he read out of my Book not being well heard, he was de-

fired

fered to hand the Book to the Minister that stood by me, and read the Quotations; which was done, and the whole Passage, containing a Prayer, was read, which is this; *Way cast up*, p. 121. *Son of* David *have mercy on us. O thou blessed Lord Jesus, that wert crucified and died for our Sins, and shed thy precious Blood for us; be gracious unto us. Thou that in the Days of thy Flesh, wert tempted of Satan, afflicted, bore our Sins on the Cross, felt our Infirmities, and wert touched with them. O thou our merciful High Priest, whose tender Bowels of Compassion, are not more straitned, since thy Ascension, but rather more enlarged, and whose Love and Kindness is the same towards thy Servants in our Days, as it was of old, help us and strengthen us, and by the Power of thy divine Life and Spirit; raise us up over all Temptations, and indue us with a Measure of the same Patience and Resignation that dwelt so fully in thee, and which thou didst so abundantly manifest in all thy Sufferings in the Days of thy Flesh. Thou art the same that thou wert, thy Heart is the same towards thy Servants, as when thou wert outwardly present with them in the Flesh. Thou art our Advocate and Mediator in Heaven with the Father: Our merciful High Priest, who is not untouched with the feeling of our Infirmities. Thou, even thou, blessed Jesus, thou knowest our most secret Desires and Breathings, which we offer up unto thee, in the Enablings of thy blessed Life and Spirit, that thou mayest present them unto thy Father and our Father, that in thee we may be accepted, and our Services also; and for thy sake our Defects and short Comings, our Sins and Transgressions that we have committed, may be forgiven us.*

The Prayer being read, divers Ministers and others said it was a good Prayer, but they never heard that any such Prayer was used in any of the Quakers Meetings: A Quaker, called *Daniel Philips*, standing by near where I stood, said that Book was approved by the second Days Meeting at *London*, which was a great Untruth: I told how I wrote that Book in *Scotland*, and from *Scotland* sent it to a Correspondent in *Holland*, who printed it there; and when it came over to *London*, in the Year 1678. it met with great Opposition from divers of the Preachers of the Quakers at *London* [as *Stephen Crisp*, *William Shewen*, *William Mede*, and *Samuel Newton*] and one of the chief things they blamed in my Book, was this very Prayer, and especially that Part of it, *Jesus Son of* David *have mercy on us*: Some of them said it was half Popery; for though *G. K.* would not pray to *Mary* the Mother of Jesus, as the Papists do, yet he was for praying to the Son of *Mary*: Others said it was Common Prayer: A larger Account of things relating to the Opposition I met with from the Quakers for that Prayer, and some other things in that Book, ye will find in the late Book called *A Defence of the Snake*, in that called *A Collection*, from p. 16. to 38. I further shewed, that what I had delivered in that Book, and others of my Books in former times when I was reckoned in Unity with the Quakers, did plainly evidence that I held the Faith of the Fundamentals of Christianity with all true Christians, though in some lesser Matters I was biassed and misled by them into divers Errors, particularly in rejecting the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper, which I have since retracted; and for my holding the fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Faith, as appears by that Book, and other Books of mine. All the Time of my Quakerism, a Quaker in *Pensylvania*, who was a Justice of Peace [his Name was *Arthur Cook*] said unto me, *George, thou never was a right Quaker all thy Days, but an old rotten Presbyterian.*

The reading of that Passage in my Book, containing the Prayer aforesaid, which the Quaker brought to make against me, had a far contrary Effect to what he intended; for many (some Ministers, and others) present said, *This makes for G. K.*

not.

not againſt him; let the Quakers bring any ſuch Paſſage out of their Books, to prove they were of that Faith with him. Some of the Quakers that objected againſt that Prayer in my Book, asked me, in one of the Meetings that were appointed to hear the Objections againſt my Book, and my Anſwers, *Where did I ever hear any* Engliſh *Friend of the Miniſtry pray after that manner? Poſſibly,* ſaid they, *ſome* Scots *Friends, who were thy Proſelytes, thou haſt heard to pray ſo:* I confeſs they gueſſed right, they were ſome *Scots* Friends whom I had heard to pray ſo, and ſo I had prayed; and being at a ſtand to inſtance any *Engliſh* Friend that I had heard ſo pray, *W. Penn* told them, he had ſo prayed, and that not long ago, but he ſaid, *It was in private:* G. *W.* ſaid, *Let the Scripture decide it*; whereupon he calls for the Bible, and reads in 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *What ſay ye to this Friends,* ſaid G. *W?* Ye ſee that *Paul* did approve the *Corinthians* that called upon the Name of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt: Their Anſwer was, *Paul was dark and ignorant in that thing, as* G. K. *is, for our Parts we know better.* Here note the Fallacy both of G. *W.* and *W. P.* who for all this ſeemingly owning Faith in the Man Chriſt Jeſus, by confeſſing they were to pray to him, yet in their printed Books have oppoſed that Faith without any Retractation.

Proofs on the third Head.

Firſt, That the Scriptures, according to the Dictates of their greateſt Teachers, are not the Word of God.

THat the Scripture is not the written Word, ſee G. Myſt. p. 68, 75. *The Word not contained in Scripture,* p. 232. *The Scriptures not the Word of Reconciliation, but Chriſt,* p. 186. *The Scriptures not infallible nor divine, but humane,* p. 302. He chargeth *C. Wade* with Blaſphemy, for affirming the Scriptures are the Word of God, G. M. p. 246, 247. Thus the Church of *England,* and all Proteſtants are guilty of Blaſphemy by his Aſſertion.

Note, This Controverſie betwixt all true Proteſtants and the Quakers, whether the Scriptures are the Word of God (which the Quakers have formerly moſt earneſtly denyed, and fiercely diſputed againſt, though ſome now begin to acknowledge it, and yet they are ſtill the ſame infallible Men) is not a meer Strife of Words, but a moſt material and important Controverſie, for when many Places of Scripture are brought to prove that God's Spirit doth inwardly teach us by means of the Word, and that Faith comes by the Word of God outwardly heard or read, that we are born of the Word, and ſanctified by it, and all ſpiritual Effects that are attributed in Scripture to God, Chriſt, and the Spirit, as the principal Agent, and to the Word as inſtrumental, they will not allow of any inſtrumental external Word, but makes the Word to be the Spirit, to be Chriſt and God, which is in effect to render them of no uſe to us at all, ſeeing by denying them to be the Word, they deny them alſo to be the external Means or Medium, whereby the Spirit teacheth us by his inward Operation in our Hearts, and works any ſaving Knowledge and Faith in us, and this alſo they have denyed, *viz.* that the Scriptures are the Means or Medium.

But that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and the Word moſt frequently ſo called in Scripture, is clear from abundant Places; to wit, the external Doctrine contained

tained in the Scriptures. *Our Gospel came unto you*, said *Paul* to the *Thessalonians*, 1 *Thess.* 1. 5. *not in Word only*; by *Word* here is meant Doctrine, *Isaiah* 28. 13. *The Word of the Lord was unto them Precept upon Precept, Line upon Line*: Here the Precepts and written Lines of the Prophets are called the Word of the Lord; and *Job*, 15. 25. there we find the Word written, ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, i. e. *the written Word*, which was a short Sentence written in one of the Psalms; but G. F. denyeth them to be the written Word, G. M. p. 68, 319.

When *Paul* bid *Timothy* preach the Word, it cannot be justly thought that he would have him only preach the inward Word, or the essential Word or Light within; but by the Word he meant the whole Doctrine of the Gospel. The Quakers but trifle when they argue the Scriptures are Words, and it is a Lye to call Words the Word, which is not a Lye, but a common Speech used by themselves, who call an Epistle a Letter, that yet contains many Letters: And they do no less trifle when they argue, to say the Scripture is the Word, is to say the Scripture is Christ, as if the Name *Word* did only belong to Christ, whereas the Name *Word*, as well as the Name *Light*, is given both to Christ and other things: Christ said to the Disciples, *Ye are the Light of the World*; and so said Christ of himself, doth it therefore follow that they were Christ? They say they call the Scriptures what they call themselves, *A Treatise, but not the Word*, quoting *Acts* 1. the former Treatise, but in the Greek it is Word; the same in *Joh.* 1. 1. Τὸν πρῶτον λόγον, &c. the former Word, where it is plain he calls all the Words written in the Gospel according to St. *Luke*, *the Word*, as each Oration in *Isocrates* or *Demosthenes* is called Λόγος, i. e. *the Word*.

Proofs that the Scriptures are not the Rule, but the Spirit or Light within, as is common to all Mankind.

G. F. G. M. p. 39, 120. and in his G. M. p. 302. he saith, *The Spirit is the Rule that leads into all Truth*, so saith Christ. Note, Here he belyes and wrongs Christ's Words; Christ did not say, *the Spirit is the Rule*, the Spirit is the Leader who leads us into all Truth, by the Line or Rule of the holy Scriptures, we not having those extraordinary Leading that the Apostles had.

Nor is this a meer Strife of Words, but a most necessary Controversie, which is the Foundation of their Deism, and their overthrowing Christiany, and yet this very Year they have reprinted *W. P.*'s Discourse concerning the general Rule of Faith and Practice, who brings fourteen Arguments to prove that the Scriptures are not the general Rule of Faith and Practice, to which I have answered in my late Book in Print, called *The Deism of* W. P. &c. Three of which Arguments of his are, 1. From their Imperfection. 2. Their Uncertainty. 3. Their Obscurity. Yea, *Jos. Wyeth* in his *Switch*, chargeth *the Scriptures with Uncertainty*. This is a most dangerous Heresie; for by this Principle they are not obliged to believe one intire Doctrine in the Apostles Creed, as indeed I could easily prove; by their Principles they do not believe one intire Article in that called *The Apostles Creed*. Switch, pag. 46.

G. F. G. M. saith, *The Apostle doth not tell us of a Creed, but the Pope's Canon Book*, p. 355. yet the Quakers now say they believe that called *The Apostles Creed*: For seeing by denying the Scriptures to be either the Medium or Rule of their Faith, what

what account can they give for their Faith, to believe one peculiar Article of Christianity?

If they say they have a peculiar Inspiration from the Light within, to believe these peculiar Doctrines; this in the first place throws down the common Illumination from being the universal Rule, for common and peculiar are differing things. But next, It is a meer Fiction, if they should say they have such a peculiar Inspiration without Scripture, *viz.* to believe that Christ was born of a Virgin, died for our Sins, rose again the third Day: *W. P.* grants the Light within doth not reveal these things to them, nor is it needful; and he grants the Scriptures are an historical Rule, but he will not allow that the Belief of the History of Christ's Birth, Death, &c. is necessary to our Salvation: *It is none of the absolute Necessaries* he saith.

But they have not only denied the Scriptures to be the Word, the Rule, the external Medium of Faith, but have given them Names of Contempt, particularly *G. F.* who has called them *earthly and carnal, Death, Ink and Paper, Dust, and Serpents Meat*, G. F's Truth's Defence, p. 14, 102. See several Papers given forth, &c. p. 45, 46. *So Dust is the Serpents Meat, their Original is but Dust, which is but the Letter, which is Death; so these Serpents feed upon Dust, which feed upon all these carnal things, and their Gospel is Dust*, Matthew, Mark, Luke, *and* John, *which is the Letter: The cursed Serpent is in the Letter*, R. Hub's Words, *Truth's Def.* p. 102. Is not this to fright People from reading the Letter, to tell them the cursed Serpent, *i. e.* the Devil is in it? Their common Defence is, that *G. F.* meant all this of the Ink and Paper, but none of all (whom he calls Serpents) that is the Protestant Churches did ever say, that the Ink and Paper was the Gospel, they meant the Doctrines and Truths declared by what is writ or printed with Ink on Paper: As for the *Switch*, Quotations out of G. M. to prove that some of his Opponents had said, *The Scripture is God, yea, the Letter of the Scripture is God, Switch*, p. 15. and for Proof of this he quotes *G. Fox*, G. M. p. 261. who affirmed that one *Roger Atkinson* affirmed, *That the Scripture is God*; but had this been so, will that justifie *G. F.* his giving them such opprobrious Names, if one or two Particulars did run into one Extream? Will this justifie *G. F.* his running into the other Extream? The bending a crooked Plant the contrary way will not serve his turn in this case: But that *G. Fox* his Evidence is not to be trusted, in his quoting his Opponents: I shall clearly prove, *G. F.* in his Great Mystery, p. 247. quotes *C. Wade* for the same Trespass that he quotes *Roger Atkinson* for, namely, that *Christopher Wade* should affirm, *That the Scripture Letter was God and Christ*; for this he quotes his Book called *Quakery Slain*, but no such Passage is to be found in all that Book; and *C. Wade*, in another Book of his, entituled, *To all those called Quakers*, he charges *G. F.* with a Hellish Lye and Slander, for affirming that he called the Letter God and Christ; see this last Book of *C. Wade*, p. 7. and compare it with his *Quakery slain*, p. 16. and his Words in that p. 16. being, *That the Letter of the New Testament or Gospel, containeth in it the mediate inspired teaching written VVord of Christ, the VVord that was and is God, which*, saith *C. VVade*, *is flat contrary to thy Lye*. And in his last cited Book, the said *C. VVade* mentions no less than twelve particular Lyes wherewith *G. F.* had belyed him in matter of fact as to his Quotations, all which I have considered, and so may others if they have the Books, and will find them indeed to be abusive Perversions and Lies of *G. F.* upon this *C. VVade*, but I shall give only two Instances more, that out of the Mouth of two or three Witnesses, that is plain matter of fact *G. F.* is guilty of

false

false Quotations, and belying the Innocent (and yet these impudent Men will defend his Infallibility) one of them is, that G. F. in his G. M. p. 246. chargeth C. *Wade* to say, *O Luciferian Pride to save Souls*; to this C. *Wade* fully and effectually answereth, and plainly detects the Lie and Perversion in his second Book, where he shews out of the seventh and eighth Page of his *Quakery slain*, that his Words were, *His crying out against* James Milner's *Luciferian Pride to save Souls as Christ did, because he pretended himself to be Christ, and audaciously took upon him to save Souls, as Christ did by his suffering Death; and hereupon* James Milner *did in a juggling manner die, and in a juggling inchanting manner, with a Knife and a Bason, he pretended his Blood was shed to save the Souls of two Women, this manner of saving Souls only,* C. *Wade blames, which* G. F. *either justifies, or renders himself a Lyer by blaming* C. Wade. See the Places themselves. C. *Wade's* second Book, p. 4.

The other Lye and Slander which G. F. is guilty of against C. *Wade*, is that in his G. M. p. 247. he makes C. *Wade* to say, *God limits the Supreme Holy One, by the inspired Writings of the Apostles*; but C. Wade's Words were, *That the Devil limits the Supreme Holy One*; see C. Wade's second Book, p. 5. compared with p. 13. of *Quakery slain*.

Note, If either the *Switch*, or G. *Whitehead* could prove the like Perversions and Lies against the Author of the *Snake*, as C. *Wade* hath here proved against G. F. how would they have sentenced him, as indeed they have, for things of small moment, in comparison of what is here justly proved against their infallible Apostle (as they pretend he was) G. F? But I do not know one Quotation of the Author of the *Snake*, out of their Books, wherein he hath in a substantial matter wronged him, as G. F. here hath wronged C. *Wade*, not only in these three, but many more.

There yet remains two Quotations out of G. *W*'s own Book, called *Truth defending the Quakers*, which he most fallaciously and sophistically endeavours to justifie. The Question being put, Whether the Quakers did esteem their Speakings to be of as great Authority as any Chapter in the Bible? 'Tis answered, *That which is spoken from the Spirit of Truth in any, is of as great Authority as the Scriptures and Chapters are, and greater.* This same Quotation is objected in a late printed Sheet, called *An Account from Colchester*, where the following Words are set down, that G. *W.* blames the *Norfolk* Priests for leaving out, which he calls *the annexed explanatory Words*, and they are these; *As Christ's Words were of greater Authority when he spoke, than the Pharisees reading the Letter, and they in whom that Spirit speaks not, are out of the Authority of the Scriptures, and their speaking we deny.* Truth and Inn. p. 16.

But first, These Words are not explanatory, but a sophistical Argument to prove the former Assertion; for G. *W.* argues, That because Christ's preaching was of greater Authority than the Pharisees reading the Scriptures, that therefore what the Spirit speaks in the Quakers, and by them, is of greater Authority than the Scriptures, which is both a false and foolish Consequence, for it supposes that the Spirit of God speaks in the Quakers when they preach or speak in Meetings, as it did in Christ and in the Apostles, *viz.* by the same divine Inspiration in kind and manner, immediately and infallibly, which cannot be granted, and the Falsehood of it appears by the many false things that they speak and write contrary to the Scriptures: And though he mentions not Quakers, yet that he does understand them, and none else, is clear from his own Words: He saith, *They in whom that Spirit speaks not, their speaking we deny.* This supposeth he grants that the Spirit spoke in some [illegible] which they did not deny, and who were these, but the Ministers

among the Quakers, seeing they deny the Ministry of all others in our Days.

Next he has an impertinent Question, as to the Division of Chapters and Verses, *Can these Men say that was done by Divine Authority?* But this is wholly from the purpose.

Another Evasion is, *That the Spirit of Truth immediately ministring in Man, or by any spiritual Minister, is of greater Authority, Power, or Efficacy, than the Chapters are, simply considered as without the Spirit.* But, *simply considered as without the Spirit*, is wholly remote from the Question, and is no ways to be allowed for any true Vindication, because the Spirit doth as truly and frequently accompany the Scriptures when read as when preached; or whatever is preached by the Spirit's Assistance, if the Hearers in reading be as sincere as the Hearers in preaching: But if the Hearers be careless, suppose Men preach by the Spirit, it doth not follow that carnal and careless Hearers hear by the Spirit, more than that they read or hear what is read by the Spirit: But if he will needs have the Words *simply and abstractly considered without the Spirit* be added to reading, let them, by the like reason, be added to preaching; what he adds of Christ and the Apostles living and powerful preaching, being of greater Efficacy, Power, and Authority, than the outward Writing or Scripture it self, *simply or abstractly considered as distinct from the Spirit*: As it was no Part of the Question, nor Answer given by him in *Truth's Defence*, so it is altogether impertinent. But he equivocates upon the Word *Authority*, taking it for the effect it hath on the Hearers; but that was not the Sense of the Word *Authority* in the Question asked; but its Sense (as it's generally among all that treat of Scripture Authority above other Writings, so taken) the Obligation or Right that doth oblige or induce us to believe the Truth of them, and that they are of divine Inspiration: This is quite another thing than the Effect or Impression that Men feel in reading or hearing them read, as well as when preached upon by way of expounding; for whether the Effect or Influence and Impression be great or little, as it is sometimes great, and sometimes little, and sometimes perhaps none, upon hardned Hearts, yet their Authority is still the same, neither greater nor less at one time than another.

The other Quotation is taken out of his *Truth defending*, and is objected against in that called *An Account from Colchester*, to which a pretended Answer is given in that called *Some Account from Colchester*, signed by seven Quakers, the Passage is this, *Is the Moral Law or ten Commandments a Rule to the Christian's Life, or is it not? Ans. Thou might as well ask if the moral Law, as thou calleſt it, be a Rule to Christ? for the Christian's Life and Rule is Christ, who is the End of the Law for Righteousness, who came not to destroy but to fulfil it.*

Some Account from Colchester, p. 9. to the End.

Note, In their Answer they grossly equivocate, in taking the Word *Christian's Life* in another Sense than was meant in the Query, and is meant in common Speech: By a Christian's Life, is meant in the Query and common Speech, a Christian's Practice and manner of Life, with respect to his Thoughts, Words, and Actions. Now, though Christ is called in Scripture the Christian's Life, by the Figure of a Metonimy, being the Author of their Life, yet he is not their Practice or Manner of Life, their thinking, speaking, and acting; and whereas they make it absurd to suppose that the moral Law was a Rule to Christ: Here they shew their Ignorance and Error, for the Man Christ had the moral Law for his Law and Rule, and it did oblige him to Obedience, and he fulfilled it in his own Person, for he was made under the Law, and though the Law is not a Rule to the Spirit of Christ in Believers, yet it is Rule of the Spirit, whereby he rules them. Next they say, *The*

ſaid Anſwer appears not to be intended to make void the moral Law or ten Commandments, but the contrary, in aſſerting Chriſt *to be the End of the Law for Righteouſneſs, and that he came not to deſtroy the Law, but to fulfil it, therefore the Righteouſneſs thereof remains, and is binding by the holy Spirit in every true Believer, though not under the Law, but under Grace, which effectually teaches, both to deny Ungodlineſs and worldly Luſts, and to live righteouſly, ſoberly, and godly in this preſent World,* Tit. 2. 11, 12. which anſwers the Subſtance and End of the Law.

Note, whereas they ſay, *The Righteouſneſs of it remains, and is binding by the holy Spirit in every true Believer, how is it binding by the Spirit, if it be not a Rule to every true Believer? Doth the Spirit bind Believers to that which is no Rule or Law?* Again, By their Limitation and Reſtriction of binding by the Spirit, they make the moral Law, as it is outwardly delivered in the holy Scriptures, to have no Obligation upon Believers at all, but only as it is inwardly revealed and given by the Spirit; and thus Chriſt's Prophetical and Kingly Office, as he outwardly delivered that Law to us, is of no Force by their Anſwer; whereas that Law, and all the other Laws of Chriſt, have their binding Authority over Believers from Chriſt the great Prophet, and King, and Head of his Church, as without them delivered by him to them, and ſealed by his Spirit in their Hearts; and though the Spirit of Chriſt in Chriſt himſelf, and in the Prophets and Apoſtles, was a Lawgiver to Men, yet the Spirit is not a Lawgiver as in us, becauſe his Law is ſufficiently given already by Chriſt, and by his Spirit in Chriſt, and in his Prophets and Apoſtles: But the Work and Office of the Spirit in us, and all Believers, is to perſwade us of the Truth and Authority of the Laws of Chriſt already given, to enlighten our Minds to underſtand them, and inwardly to ſtrengthen us by his Grace, and gracious Influences and Operations to obey them. But to hold that the holy Spirit is any Lawgiver to Believers ſince the Days of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, is of no leſs dangerous Conſequence, than to overthrow Chriſtianity, and introduce Deiſm and Mahumetiſm: For indeed, upon that Pretence, the Laws of the Turks Alcoran are ſet up, and by the ſame Pretence *G. F.* did throw down Chriſt's Inſtitutions of Baptiſm and the Supper, and Church-Government by Paſtors and Elders, and ſet up Laws and Rules that he pretended to have given him by the Spirit; and this was the Pretence of the ancient Montaniſts: Yea, *W. Penn*, on this very Pretence, rejects Baptiſm and the Supper, affirming, *That the ſame Spirit that led the Apoſtles to reject Circumciſion, hath led the Quakers to reject the outward Baptiſm and Supper.*

Laſtly, whereas they ſay, *A Believer is not under the Law, but under Grace*; this doth not juſtifie their vile Hereſie, *That the moral Law is not a Rule of Life to Chriſtians*; for though they are not under the Curſe and Condemnation of it, nor as it is a Law of Works, ſo as thereby to be juſtified, yet they are under it, even as outwardly given by Chriſt and his Prophets and Apoſtles, as a Rule of Life: And thus, as they diſannul and make void the moral Law of the Ten Commandments, ſo all the other poſitive Laws and Commands of the Goſpel, making the Goſpel nothing but the Light within all Mankind, and Goſpel Commands nothing but what that dictates, though they are not agreed about the Commands of the Light within, either their Number or Duration, or whether there are any new Commands given in this Age, as *G. F.* pretends was given to him, and by him to the Quakers.

But again, How doth it appear, that their Anſwer doth not make void the moral Law or Ten Commandments, when they reject the Morality of the fourth Commandment, and do not allow, that one Day of ſeven is to be obſerved, and

to be ſanctified, by abſtaining from ſervile Labour, and giving that Day to religious Exerciſe, as appears from another Quotation in that called *An Account from Colcheſter*, taken out of G. *W*'s *Truth defending*? To which they pretend to give anſwer, in that called *Some Account from Colcheſter*, p. 11. *Did that Quaker ſin therein or not, who brought lately, on the Lord's Day, an old Doublet into* Dr. Gell's *Church in* London, *and ſate upon the Communion Table mending it, while the Dr. was preaching; the Pariſhioners forbidding him*? In their Anſwer they expoſtulate with him, *as if it were Popery to count it a Crime or Sin to work upon the Communion Table, as if it were a more holy Place than another*. But though it have no inherent Holineſs, yet it being dedicated to that Uſe, every ſober Chriſtian will ſay, it was a great Sin by diverſe aggravating Circumſtances, as done in Contempt of the Inſtitution of our Lord himſelf, who appointed the Practice of breaking of Bread; and that there ſhould be a Table, is evident from Scripture, that mentions the Table of the Lord. Secondly, The doing of it while the Dr. was preaching. Thirdly, The wilful Offence deſignedly given to the People preſent, upon Pretence of bearing witneſs againſt their Idolatry and idolatrous Practice, as the Quakers were wont to cenſure it. Fourthly, The doing of it on the firſt Day of the Week, ſet apart from ſervile Labour, to the Worſhip of God. Fifthly, The Breach of that golden Law of Equity, *Not doing as they would be done by*; for would not the Quakers account it a great Sin and Treſpaſs, if any of the Church of *England*, or Diſſenter, ſhould ſit in one of their Galleries where they ſtand to preach, and kneel at Prayer, and mend an old Doublet, while they are preaching in their Meeting Places? Surely they would greatly aggravate it, and call it rude and unmannerly and profane. Again, whereas they query, *Where doſt thou read in the Scripture, that Men muſt do no Work on the firſt Day of the Week*? And this Query is made to juſtifie the Quaker's ſitting on the Communion Table to mend an old Doublet on the firſt Day, in time of Divine Service. Is not this a great Shame, to print and reprint ſuch avowed Profanation of the Lord's Day, and Worſhip alſo, in the Face of a Proteſtant Nation, that zealouſly profeſs to be againſt the Profanation of it, and where are ſtanding Laws againſt the Profanation of it?

Note here, that whereas the Quakers affirm that what they ſpeak and write, is immediately and infallibly from God; their profeſſed Principle obligeth them to hold, *that what they ſpeak and write, is of greater Certainty, and conſequently of greater Authority than the Scriptures, becauſe they are certain of what they ſpeak and write from the Spirit in themſelves, but they are not certain of the Writings of the Scriptures*, as *W. P.* argues in his Diſcourſe concerning the *General Rule*: *They have not the* Autographa, *the Copies differ, and ſo do the Tranſlations, but they have their own* Autographa, *and their Books and Writings are from the Original immediately*. Thus when *G. W.* ſent me his Curſe, *Thus ſaith the Lord*, &c. and ſigned *G. W.* This had more Authority with him than the Scripture, by his own Doctrine, and if he pleaſe, let him add, *ſimply conſidered as without the Spirit*.

Proofs on the fourth Head. Concerning the Holy Trinity.

G. W's. Truth and Inn. p. 50.

George Whitehead, in his *Truth and Inn.* and *Jof. Wyeth*, in his *Switch*, pretends, *That it is not the Doctrine or thing intended that they deny, i. e. the Father, the Word, and Holy Spirit, which three are one.*

And

And saith *Jos. Wyeth*, *We own their Distinction in all the Instances of it recorded in Holy Writ.* The only thing they pretend to scruple at or deny, is the calling them three Persons, which they say are not Scripture Terms, and they are wholly for keeping to Scripture Terms in Matters of Doctrine. Switch, p. 184.

But to this I say first, How many unscripture Terms do they frequently use? Where do they find in Scripture, the Term *immediate Revelation, immediate teaching of the Spirit, immediate Word*, which they so commonly use? Again, where do they find in Scripture, *That, see G.M.p. 324. the Seed, to which the Promise of Salvation is, is Christ within?* And that Expression, where do they find it in Scripture, *That the same Spirit takes upon it the same Seed, which is Christ, now as ever*, &c. *That God the Father took upon him Humane Nature, That the Spirit is the Rule*; and many more, not only unscripture Terms, but contrary to Scripture? But why do they call them *Three Witnesses*, as *G. W.* hath so expressly called them? Where do they find them in Scripture so called? That Place in *John's* first Epistle doth not call them *Three Witnesses*, but *Three bearing Record, or witnessing.* Several Papers, &c. p. 47.

But it is not only the Words, *Three Persons*, wherewith they are offended (tho unjustly, for personal Acts and Properties are given to them, and therefore, according to plain Consequence from Scripture, they may be called Persons) but the Doctrine or thing intended they deny, for they allow not that they are distinct, otherwise than in Manifestation; see *G. W's Divinity of Christ*, p. 94. he saith, *The Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit (or the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) are one and inseparable, no where in Scripture called three separate Persons, nor finite in Personalities, though Three [in Manifestation] and so testified of (as Three Witnesses) for the Confirmation of the Gospel.*

Note, Seeing *G. W.* doth not own them to be Three, otherwise but in Manifestation, this is not only to deny the Names or Words, *Three Persons*, but to deny that they were Three from all Eternity, or before all Ages, for there was no Manifestation, either of One, or Two, or Three from Eternity: His calling them *Three in Manifestation*, is to call them *three Manifestations*; and seeing all Manifestation has a Beginning with Time, by his Doctrine there were not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three any wise distinct from Eternity: There was no God the Father from Eternity that did beget, nor no Son from Eternity that was begotten, nor Holy Ghost that from Eternity did proceed from the Father and the Son, by *G. Whitehead's* Doctrine.

And *F. Hougil*, in his *Collection*, p. 308. delivers the same erronious Doctrine: He saith, *That the Holy Ghost is called another (than Christ:) Another is not understood of another Life, of another Substance; but is understood of another Manifestation, or Operation of the same God, who subsists in the same Power in which the Father, the Son, and the Spirit subsist, as I said unto thee before: Another, as to distinguish of the Operation and Work of the Spirit and of the Son, we do not refuse.* By this Doctrine of *F. Hougil*, they are but distinct Manifestations, Operations, and Works.

Now if *G. W.* or the Author of the *Switch* will say, that there were three Manifestations, Operations, or Works in the Godhead from all Eternity: It is absurd to suppose such Manifestations, beside that they are unscripture Terms, the same Arguments that they use against three Persons, will as much, and indeed much more, be of Force against three Manifestations; for if the Father be a Manifestation from Eternity, of what is he a Manifestation? Can he be a Manifestation of himself? Or is he a Manifestation of the Son, who (as they say) is a Manifestation? Thus one:

one Manifestation would be the Manifestation of another Manifestation; but then what would the Holy Spirit be a Manifestation of?

And seeing in God there are no Accidents, these three Manifestations are not three Accidents, nor three Subsistences, nor three Substances, nor three Persons; and consequently (according to these Men) they are nothing at all but their own Inventions.

But *W. Penn*, in his *Sandy Foundation*, has not only argued against three Persons, but against the Holy Three, for he bringeth five Arguments against their being a Holy Three, Page 12, 13, 14. one of which is this in express Words: *Since the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Spirit is God* (which their Opinion necessitates them to confess) *then unless the Father, Son, and Spirit are three distinct nothings, they must be three distinct Substances, and consequently, three distinct Gods.* Now let his Argument be applied to the unscripture Terms, three Manifestations, and it will have the same Force, or rather greater; but indeed it hath none at all against three distinct Persons, for there is a plain Distinction of a Medium in created Beings, betwixt Substance and Nothing, the three Dimensions of a Body, *Length*, *Breadth*, and *Depth*, are neither three Nothings, nor three Substances; the Understanding, Will, and Locomotive Power of Man's Soul, are neither three Nothings, nor three Substances, and yet they are but one Soul, though all Creaturely Similitudes are improper to express this Mystery.

Beside, how could a Manifestation become Flesh, or take Man's Nature, as the Son did? And how could one Manifestation send another, or beget another, or a third Manifestation proceed from two other Manifestations?

But whereas *Jos. Wyeth* saith in his *Switch*, p. 184. *We own their Distinction in all the Instances of it recorded in Holy Writ*: In contradiction to this, hear *R. Hougil*, in his *Collection*, p. 251. he calls it damnable Doctrine to say, *That Christ must be distinct from the Father and the Holy Ghost*: Before in God, and now from God; their Quibble about separate doth not help them, for some that have so called them, have declared they meant nothing by separate but distinct; and now if *Jos. Wyeth* and *G. W.* will have distinct to signifie separate, seeing they pretend to own the Distinction of the Father and the Son, they must own the Separation.

And whereas, the Teachers among the Quakers profess they are not changed in any thing of Doctrine or Practice, from what they were from the Beginning, *for Truth is one* (say they) *and changes not, and as God is one, and Truth is one and changeth not, so his People are one*: Now let us compare the Doctrine of *G. Whitehead*, what it was in the Year 1659. when he writ his *Truth defending the Quakers* (which he said was written from the Spirit of Truth) concerning the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and what it was in the Year 1697. when he wrote his *Antidote against the Venome of the Snake*.

In his *Truth defending*, &c. printed 1659. in p. 2. he saith, *What the Scripture saith of the Godhead, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, which are one*, 1 Joh. 5. 7. *we own, but deny the Popish Term of three distinct Persons, which you call God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, which tends to the dividing God, and to the making three Gods*: [Note, here he not only denies the three Persons, but the Orthodox and Scriptural Explanation of them, of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost,] *And thou who hast vindicated such a Dream, could never prove it by the Scripture, when thou wast put upon it: And do not you Priests, in your Divinity, as you call it, affirm, that a Person is a single rational compleat Substance, and differing from another*

by an incommunicable Property? And are thou so blind, &c. to think that there is such a Difference in the Godhead? Seeing Christ is equal with his Father who is a Spirit, then what incommunicable Property can be differ in from the Father, that is not communicable to the one as well as the other? Here we see, he not only opposes the Terms, *Three Persons*, but the Distinction of the Three their *incommunicable Properties*, which are these, That the Father begot the Son from everlasting, the Son was begot of the Father from everlasting, and the Holy Ghost did proceed, both from the Father and the Son from everlasting; and surely the Father's Property is incommunicable to the Son, and so is the Son's to the Father, and the Holy Ghost's Property to both, for it cannot be said, that the Son begot the Father, or that the Son is the Father, *&c.* or that the Holy Ghost is either the Father or the Son.

But now let us hear his late Doctrine in his printed *Antidote*, 1697. p. 139. *Though 'tis true* (saith he) *in one Sense, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are not essentially distinct, as to their divine Being, which is but one, they are but one God; but in respect to their Properties of Relation, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as such they are distinct, but not divided nor separate, either in themselves, or VVork of the old or new Creation.* First, G. *VV.* should tell us, where doth he find in Scripture, in expres Terms, that they are distinct in respect to their Properties of Relation. Secondly, Whether these Properties of Relation are communicable or incommunicable Properties: Surely he must say, incommunicable, and that he did in his Book, *Truth defending*, expresly deny: For if he should say, these Properties are communicable, such as God's absolute Properties are, as holy, wise, good, *&c.* then the Son might beget, and the Father might be begotten. And lastly, Seeing he now owns a Distinction of Properties of Relation, though in unscripture Terms, he must, by good consequence, own three Persons to be the Subjects of those Properties, for no Properties, or Predicates, or Attributes, can be without their proper Subjects; for though it is the Father's Property to have begot the Son from everlasting, yet the Father is not a Property, but the Person or Subject that has that Property. Thus we see, how *Proteus*-like G. *VV.* has changed his Shapes in the Years 1659. and 1697. and yet there is no Shadow of Change in him for all this, if we will believe him. But further, by some of his late Books, we shall find him, not only owning the Distinction of the three, in respect to their Properties of Relation, but advanced much nearer, (so far as to disown his former Opposition to the Terms *Three Persons*, which in his Book called *Ishmael*, that was his jointly with others, he had charged his Opponent to have conjured out of one, and told him, *that both they and he are shut up in perpetual Darkness for the Lake*; and this he doth in two several Books, one printed in the Year 1690. called *The Christianity of the People commonly called Quakers*, where he lets down the Words quoted out of his *Ishmael* more largely; the other called *Truth and Innocency*, printed this very Year, 1699. where he leaves out the most offensive Words, and puts an *&c.* in their room, as being (I suppose) ashamed of them, and well he might; but he is not ashamed to affirm, he is not changed in his Faith. But let us hear how he excuseth what he writ in his *Ishmael*, that was printed in the Year 1655. Though his Name is at the Book, yet he positively dis- Truth and owns the Words, and affirms, *They are none of his, and that he writ not that Part of* Inn. p. 51. *the Answer to* Townsend: And in his Book, called *The Christianity*, &c. above mentioned, he saith *He looks on the Words as wrong writ, or wrong printed, and that he razed them out, or corrected them long since, where he has met with that Answer.*

But

But is not this a Piece of dull Sophistry to save the Credit of his Infallibility? Had he not better, more like a Man and a Christian, acknowledged his Error, than to lay the Fault upon [as wrong writ, or wrong printed?] And if he corrected them long since, how comes it that he never published his Correction in any of the Books he has published since, betwixt the Year 1655. and 1690. containing the space of 36. Years?

But for evidence against him, that he hath not sincerely said, *That he writ not that Part of the Book*, it is enough that he owned it, and this I can prove, that without Exception, he owned it to be his jointly with these others who signed it with him, as appears from his *Truth defending the Quakers*, p. 1. printed four Years after the *Ishmael*: And he belches out the like antichristian and profane Expressions against the three Persons in the Godhead, in Terms equivalent to those in the *Ishmael*. He saith, in his first Page, in Answer to the first Question, *Do not you repent for your endeavouring vainly to defend*, August 29. 1659. *in so great a Congregation, these Positions printed in a Book writ by* George Whitehead? He answers for himself and his Brethren thus: *The Positions we defended, are according to the Scriptures of Truth, and them we need not repent of.* These were they contained in that very Book called *Ishmael*, as doth appear out of the Book *Ishmael* it self; [here the Book was produced] one of which Positions were, in asserting the *Scriptures or Writing not to be the Word*: Another was, *That there is no such Word in the Scriptures, as Three Persons in the Trinity, but it is a Popish Doctrine, as the Mass or Common-Prayer-Book mentions it. Fourthly, And thou that affirms three distinct Persons in the Godhead, art a Dreamer, and he that dreams, and tells Lies, contrary to the Scriptures of Truth which we own, he with his Imaginations and Dreams, is for the Lake.* Here it is plain, that by his Imaginations and Dreams, *G. W.* meant the Ministers Doctrines of calling the Scriptures *the Word*, and affirming that there are three Persons in the Godhead; so whereas he said in his *Ishmael*, *Townsend and the three Persons are shut up in perpetual Doctrines*: Here in *Truth defending*, &c. he saith, *He with his Imaginations and Dreams* [that is the three Persons] *is for the Lake*: Now this is not one whit more sober than his Words in the *Ishmael*, how then is it that *G. Whitehead* has not found some shift to put this part of his *Truth defending* upon another? Again, in his *Truth defending*, &c. p. 25. he plainly owns that Book called *Ishmael* to be his, four Years after it was printed; and now, though in his *Truth defending*, &c. he saith, *That he and his Brethren need not repent of the Positions laid down in that called* Ishmael; yet now in the Year 1690. in his *Christianity*, he saith, *He was sorry his Name was to that Paper*; and yet, as before is mentioned, in *Truth defending*, p. 1. he saith, *They need not repent of it.* Is not this a plain Change in *G. W. He need not repent of what was writ*, and yet *was sorry that it was writ*: Formerly he owned that Book in the Year 1659, and in the Year 1690, *He writ not that Part, and was sorry it was writ*; and all this without any Change in his Mind? But when People are sorry for what they do, we commonly reckon they repent of it.

This offensive Passage, objected against *G. Whitehead*, out of his *Ishmael*, was objected against him by *Christopher Wade*, in his *Quakery slain*, p. 9. printed in 1657. And though *G. W.* printed against *C. Wade*, in his *Truth defending*, 1659. yet he then took no notice of that Passage, to disown it to be his.

But how is it that *G. W.* disowns what was written in the Book called *Ishmael*, against the three Persons? Doth he now own the three Persons not to be Popish, as he formerly charged them, *Truth def.* p. 2? Though he has not in the least retracted

his

his abuſive and reviling Speeches againſt this glorious Truth, both in the *Iſhmael*, and in his *Truth defending*, &c. [for that would reflect upon his Infallibility) yet he would ſeem now to own the Doctrine of the three Perſons, ſince the Act for Toleration came forth, for that Act of Toleration does except thoſe who deny, in their preaching or writing, the Doctrine of the bleſſed Trinity, as it is declared in the Articles of Religion, *viz.* the 39 Articles. But that *G. W.* may have the Benefit of the Act (which at preſent he has not by Law, whatever he has by Indulgence) he ought alſo to diſown ſome other abuſive Expreſſions of his, and ſophiſtical Arguings he has uſed in his other Books, as particularly, not only in his *Truth defending*, &c. above mentioned ; but in his *Divinity of Chriſt*, ſigned by the two Letters, G. *W.* ſee p. 18. he hath theſe Words, *As to* T. D's *telling of the Son of God's Incarnation, the Creation of his Body and Soul, the Parts of that Nature he ſubſiſted in*, &c. *To this I ſay* (ſaith G. *W.*) *if the Body and Soul of the Son of God were both created, doth not this render him a fourth Perſon?* And as nonſenſical and abuſive is the reaſoning of *G. Fox* their great Apoſtle, in the Epiſtle prefixed to the *Divinity*, ſigned by him and *John Stubbs*, where, in the 9th Page of that Epiſtle, they thus argue; ---*And he ſpeaks again, in his 14th Page, of three diſtinct Perſons are one with the Godhead: Now Reader, is not here four, to wit, three Perſons and the Godhead?* And thus G. F. and G. *W.* make no leſs, by their wild and nonſenſical Reaſonings, than five Perſons in the Godhead, an Abſurdity they would fix on the Doctrine of three Perſons ; for by their Arguments, the Godhead is the fourth Perſon, and Chriſt's created Soul and Body is the fifth: Do not theſe Paſſages require a Retractation, and will they ſay they are Proteſtants, and one with the Church of *England* in Matter of Doctrine, and in the common Principles of Chriſtianity, and yet boldly ſtand in the Defence of thoſe abuſive Paſſages?

But whereas they argue (*ad hominem*) that there muſt be five Perſons, if Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt be ſaid to be three Perſons, ſeeing G. *W.* calls them *three Witneſſes*, by their nonſenſical Argument, there muſt be five Witneſſes that bear Record in Heaven, *viz.* the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, and the Godhead ; theſe are four, and the created Soul and Body of Chriſt, that is the fifth: But *G. W.* has a way to evade this laſt, by denying that Chriſt has any created Soul or Body, as in the Words in p. 18. above mentioned doth appear, for which I ſhall have ſome uſe hereafter.

Joſ. Wyeth, in his *Switch*, p. 184. would make his Readers believe, *It's only the Word Perſon they object againſt, as too groſs: We cannot* (ſaith he) *but think the Word Perſon too groſs to expreſs them.*

But to detect this Fallacy, pray let us take notice, that G. F. whom he calls an Apoſtle, has expreſly owned *the Perſon of the Father*, G. M. p. 247. *But thou ſaith, Chriſt doth not dwell in them perſonally, doth not Chriſt dwell in his Saints, as he is in the Perſon of the Father, the Subſtance? And are not they of his Fleſh, and of his Bone?*

Again, *G. Fox*, G. M. p. 248. owns expreſly Chriſt's Perſon ; for firſt, having cited his Opponent's Words ; *It is a falſe thing to ſay Chriſt's Perſon is in Man*; in his Anſwer (without finding the leaſt fault with the Term Perſon) he makes Oppoſition thus, *Which is as much as to ſay, none are of his Fleſh, or of his Bone, nor eat it, nor had not his Subſtance.*

By this it appears, that G. F. did not find fault, either with the Word *Perſon*, as belonging to the Father, or with Chriſt's Perſon, but he will not allow them to be two Perſons, but one Perſon. But if any will ſay, he allowed them to be two Perſons,

ſons, then by the Arguments, both of *G. F.* and *G. VV.* they muſt be two Gods; for if three Perſons infer by Argument, three Gods, by the ſame Argument, two Perſons will infer two Gods.

The above mentioned Words of *G. F.* in G. M. *Doth not Chriſt dwell in his Saints, as he is in the Perſon of the Father, the Subſtance?* *Joſ. VVyeth*, in his *Switch*, recites as quoted out of the *Snake*: Here the *Switch* finds no fault with *G. Fox*'s owning the Perſon of the Father, which were *G. F*'s own Words, but labors to prove, that by that ſpiritual Oneneſs betwixt Chriſt and his Followers, *G. F.* did not mean to make the Soul of the ſame Perſon and Subſtance with God, which how ineffectual his Labor is in that, may be ſhewn afterwards.

Note, that the *Switch* doth juſtifie *G. F.* his Saying, *That God the Father did take upon him Humane Nature*, p. 190. and in *Truth's defence*, by *G. F.* p. 85. *The Son's Body is called the Father's; they are one, not two*, viz. *the Son and the Father.*

But here, once more on this Head, let us take notice of *G. VV*'s Fallibility and ſelf-Contradiction in moſt evident manner. In his *Light and Life*, p. 47. he blames his Opponent, *VV. B.* for theſe Words following, concerning Chriſt; *Now, as he was God, he was Co-creator with the Father, and ſo was before* Abraham, *and had Glory with God before the VVorld was, and in this Senſe came down from Heaven.* To this *G. VV.* replies, *VVhat Nonſence and unſcripture Language is this, to tell of God being Co-creator with the Father, or that God had Glory with God? Doth not this imply two Gods, and that God had a Father, let the Reader judge?* Note how he calleth it Nonſence and unſcripture Language, to ſay, *That Chriſt, as God, had Glory with God, and that he had a Father*; which is a plain Evidence that *G. VV.* denied the eternal divine Generation of the Son, contrary both to the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian* Creed, and Scripture alſo. But let us ſee how he excuſes himſelf in his *Antidote*, p. 188. *But the Phraſe, God Co-creator with God, I think ſtill implies two Creators, and conſequently two Gods. 'Tis not the Particle* Co, *with, in this caſe, will excuſe the matter, for* Co *or* Con *is* ſimul, *together, as Co-workers, Co-partners, which are more diſtinct Agents than one, but the Creator is but one God, one VVord, one Spirit, and ſo one Creator.*

Note, Here we ſee the Force of *G. VV*'s Argument againſt Chriſt the Word, being God, Co-creator with the Father, is, that it would infer the Father and the Son to be *Co-workers, and conſequently two Gods.* This *Antidote* he writ in the Year 1697. but in the Year 1674. wherein he publiſhed his *Quakers Plainneſs*, in p. 24. he allows the Father and the Son to be *Co-workers* in the following Words; *That the Diſtinction of the Father and the Son, is not only nominal (as this Oppoſer implies againſt us) but real, in the divine Relation of Father and Son; the Son as being the only begotten of the Father, and alſo known as Co-workers; in the Order and Degrees of Manifeſtation and Diſcovery*, where it is plain, by his late manner of arguing, in his *Antidote*, againſt the Father and the Son being *Co-workers*, that it doth infer two Gods; that in his Saying, in his *Quakers Plainneſs*, as above quoted, *That the Father and the Son are known as Co-workers*; he has rendred himſelf guilty, by his own Argument, of holding the Father and the Son to be two Gods: This is not only a Contradiction to himſelf, but a ſevere Cenſure on himſelf, that in the Year 1674. he was guilty of Idolatry, in holding, *That the Father and the Son are two Gods.*

Note Reader, that the Quakers uſe to object two things againſt my charging Contradictions upon *G. VV.* and other their principal Authors: Firſt, *That I have contradicted my ſelf in my former and later Writings*: To this I have anſwered, What in my later Writings I have retracted of my formes Errors, is no Contradiction; for that's

that's a Contradiction, when a Man holds contradictory Propoſitions to be both true [*ſimul & ſemel*] without retracting his Errors. But what a Man retracts, he is no more chargeable with; let G. *W.* and his Brethren retract their Errors, and I ſhall ceaſe to charge them with them, or with Contradictions. Secondly, they object, *That I may find as many Contradictions in the Scriptures, as in their Books:* Thus we ſee how they undervalue the Scriptures, to be as contradictory as their Authors; but I deny there are any real Contradictions in the Scriptures, but there are many in the Quakers Authors.

Again further, hear a Quotation out of the *Primmer* of *G. F. junior*, and *S. Criſp*, p. 24. *And they that come to ſee and know the Son, they come to ſee and know the Father alſo, for the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, as ſaith the Scriptures, and they are called by one Name, which is,* The Word, *or* The Light, *For the Word is God, and Chriſt is the Word, and God is Light, and Chriſt is the Light of the World, and the Spirit of Life proceeds from God and Chriſt, who are Light.*

Note, Seeing they hold that the Father and the Son are called by one Name, which is, *The Word*, and that the Father is the Word, and the Son is the Word, it is evident they make no Diſtinction betwixt the Father and Son? and therefore, according to their falſe Doctrine, ſeeing the Word was made Fleſh, and the Father is the Word, the Father was made Fleſh, the Father was born of a Virgin, the Father ſuffered Death on the Croſs, yea, the Father is the Son, and the Son is the Father, which is a plain overturning the great Fundamentals of Chriſtianity; yet this *Primmer* is ſo highly magnified among the Quakers, that almoſt every Family of them have it to teach it their Children, and they call it in the Preface, *A Fruit of the Plant of Righteouſneſs, given forth for the removing the Uſe of ſuch Books and Catechiſms, as are ſprung forth of the corrupt Tree, which now is to be burned, and its Fruit rejected:* Now theſe are all the Books and Catechiſms publiſhed by any others but themſelves.

Again, in p. 23. they ſay, *And though ſome have known him* (viz. *Chriſt after the Fleſh*) *yet henceforth know they him ſo no more, as ſay the Scriptures of Truth.*

Note, Here they pervert the true Sence of *Paul's* Words, as they commonly do in their Books and Preachings, giving *Paul's* Words for a Reaſon why they do not preach Faith in Chriſt, as he came in the Fleſh, died, and roſe again, *&c.* as neceſſary to Salvation, becauſe, ſay they, *We are no more to know Chriſt after the Fleſh*; whereas it was the great Subject, both of *Paul's* Preaching, and of all the Apoſtles, to wit, Jeſus Chriſt, as he came in the Fleſh, died for our Sins, and roſe again, and aſcended, *&c.* inſomuch, that they did, with one Accord, declare, *That the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, with all the ſaving and ſanctifying Graces of the Spirit, do come to Men, by Chriſt, through Faith in him, as he came in the Fleſh, died, roſe, and aſcended; and that this Faith was wrought in Men by hearing the Word outwardly preached.*

Again, in p. 23. they ſay, *Now Children, the Scriptures of Truth do declare of God and Chriſt, and the Spirit of Truth, which are one; but the Scriptures cannot bring you to know God, and Chriſt, and the Spirit of Truth:* And yet they ſay, concerning this *Primmer*, and the Contents of it, p. 2. *That they are very uſeful for Children and others to* Learn, *that they may be turned unto the Light, which is the Gift of God:* Here they ſeem to prefer their *Primmer* to the Scriptures; for they ſay, of the Contents of their *Primmer*, *That they are very uſeful for Children and others to Learn:* To learn what? Surely ſome Knowledge of God and Chriſt they will ſay, and yet they will not allow ſo much to the Scripture; and on a diligent Search, I find not, in all this *Primmer*, one ſimple Direction, to Children and others, to read the Scriptures, and

what they have quoted of Scripture in it, is but little, and much, even of that, grosly perverted and misapplied, as in p. 44, 45. they say, *They that hear the Light* [*that is in all Men, and common to all Men*] *they hear God, for God is Light, and they that hear God, they hear Christ also, for God and Christ are one* (*as saith the Scripture*) *and they that hear Christ, hear the Author of the true Faith, and so hear the Saviour of their Souls, and the Light is that Prophet, which all that hear not him, are to be cut off.*

Here we see how grosly they pervert that Place of Scripture, *Deut.* 18. 15. *Acts* 3. 22. 7. 37. which is not to be understood of the common Illumination given to all Mankind, but of the Man Christ, as he outwardly came in the Flesh, and did execute his prophetical Office on Earth, by preaching and teaching; and as he doth now still execute his prophetical Office in his Church, by his Word outwardly preached, and his Spirit inwardly accompanying it to make it effectual.

Again, p. 82. they run into the same wild Notion, that others, Familists and mad Enthusiasts run into, of the Blood of Christ within them: *For*, say they, *and all wait together in the Light* [viz. *as it is common to all Mankind, Infidels, Jews, Mahumetans, Heathens*; for so they understand it] *and believe in it, that ye may be the Children of the Light, and therein watch unto Prayer, and one over another, and this will beget ye into unfeigned Love, and walk in the Light, ye will have true Unity and Fellowship one with another, and the Blood, which is the Life of Jesus Christ, ye will feel cleansing you from all Sin, and so ye will come into Unity with God.*

Note, By this it is evident, as will more fully appear on a particular Head following, that by the Blood, which they call the Life of Jesus Christ, they meant not his Blood outwardly shed, or his Life that he outwardly laid down, *viz.* the Life of his Manhood without us, for the Remission of our Sins, and cleansing therefrom: But according to their usual Cant and Phrase, *The Blood, that is the Life, and the Life is the Light within*: So that they make the Blood, the Life, and the Light within them, to be one and the same thing; but neither in this *Primmer*, nor in any other of their Books, do I find the least Direction to Faith in the Blood of Christ, as it was outwardly shed on the Cross, therefore in this *Primmer*, and in their other Books, *they give Poison to poor Children, to suck or receive, instead of wholesome Food.*

George

George Keith's Fourth Narrative,

OF HIS

Proceedings at Turners-Hall, 1699.

For the Detecting the

QUAKERS ERRORS.

PART II.

Containing the Proofs out of the Quakers Books on the fifth Head, concerning Christ, his Incarnation, his Soul, Body, and Blood. And on the sixth Head, concerning the Souls of Men.

Read at the second Meeting at Turners-Hall, *January* 19. 1699.

W. P. in *Serious Apology*, p. 146. saith, *That the outward Person which suffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny.*

This is expresly contrary to many Texts of Scripture, and to a great Fundamental Article of our Christian Creed; yea, in a manner, it overthrows the whole Christian Creed: See the following Scriptures, *Mat.* 16. 13, 16. *Luke* 1. 32. *Mat.* 14. 33. *Mark* 1. 1. *John* 1. 14, 34. *John* 9. 35. 10. 36. *Acts* 8. 37. *Rom.* 1. 4. *Mat.* 27. 54.

G.W. in his *Truth and Inn.* p. 52. excuseth *W.P.*'s Words thus, *Here I take him to mean the Son of God, in respect to his Divine Being, as he is of one Substance with the Father, which his Body that suffered Death was not, though he was truly the Son of God, as he took upon him that Body, and as made of a Woman*: Gal. 4. 4. *Being conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin* Mary.

The Fallacy of this is easily detected, the Question in Debate betwixt *W. P.* and his Opponents, who were Presbyterian Ministers in *Ireland*, was not whether the Body was the Son of God, abstractly considered from the Soul of Christ and his Godhead, for no Presbyterian ever held that, neither will any Socinian that deny-

eth

eth the Godhead of Christ say, that that meer Body, without his created Soul, was the Christ or Son of God. But the true State of the Question was and is, whether he that outwardly suffered Death without the Gates of *Jerusalem*, (whom *W. P.* calls *that outward Person*, in Distinction from the Light within, which the Quakers will have to be the whole Christ, according to *G. Fox*'s Doctrine) was and is not properly the Son of God, which all sound Christians say, according to Scripture, he was and is, being both God and Man, and yet one Person, one Christ, one Son of God, having his Godhead-Nature, and his Manhood-Nature, so united as to constitute one Christ, which is by a miraculous and extraordinary Union, that no other Creatures, neither Angels or Men, are dignified with? and though Christ, as Man, was the Son of God, miraculously conceived and born in Time, and also, as God, was, by a Generation from Eternity, before all Worlds and Times, yet he is but one Son of God, and because of the personal Union of the Word with his Manhood, both as God and Man he is properly the Son of God.

But there is yet another Fallacy in *G. W*'s Words, which is, that neither the visible Body, nor Manhood, that was born of the Virgin, was any Part of the true Christ, or Son of God; and first, As to that visible Body of Flesh and Bones, he denies that Christ consisted of it. *I distinguish* (said he) *between consisting and having, Christ had* [*visible*] *Flesh and Bones, but he did not consist of them*, Christian Quaker, p. 139, 140. This shews us the very Heart of their Heresie. In like manner, *W. P.* argues, for 16. Pages in his *Rejoinder* against *Faldo, That Christ never died, for they will not have any thing properly to be the Christ, but his Godhead*, which they make to be all one, identically and essentially with his Heavenly Manhood, consisting of Heavenly Flesh and Blood, that he had from all Eternity.

W. P's Rejoinder, p. 299, to 307.

Here a Quaker, called *John Whiting*, opposed, in Defence of *W. Penn*, and said, *W. Penn did not deny, that that outward Person was the Son of God*: I askt him, whose Son was he properly? He said, *The Son of* Mary: I replied; *Mary* was his Mother, but who was his Father properly? He said, *He was conceived by the Holy Ghost*: I again replied, But that's no Answer to my Question, who was his Father? Every Son must have a Father, and seeing Christ had no immediate Father but God, then surely he was properly the Son of God, as the Scripture plainly testifieth.

To this he made no Reply, but opposed in Defence of *G. W.* I having said, that *G. W.* denied that visible Body, that hung on the Cross, to be any Part of the true Christ; I replied, I have proved it already, by the late Quotation here read, wherein he says, *He denies that Christ consisted of Flesh and Bones; I distinguish*, said he, *between consisting and having, Christ had Flesh and Bones, but did not consist of them, as a Man has a Coat or Garment, but doth not consist of it, and that outward Person that suffered at* Jerusalem, *was Christ by a Metonimy* (saith *W. P.*) *of the thing containing, having the Name of the thing contained*: And at this rate, *W. P.* himself may be called Christ, because he hath Christ in him. The Excuse, *That Christ did not* Meerly *consist of Flesh and Bones*, signifies nothing, for that was no Part of the Question betwixt *G. W.* and his Opponent: None ever said, That Christ did meerly consist of Flesh, Blood, and Bones; no Socinian will so affirm, for that were to say, Christ was meerly a Body of Flesh and Bones, without a rational Soul; whatever hath Parts, doth consist of those Parts, incompleatly of one or more Parts, compleatly of them all: The Foundation of the Quakers great Error on this Head, lieth here, That because Christ was before the Body was, therefore that Body is no Part of him, which is easily answered thus, Christ was before that Body was, but he was not com-

compleatly, and in all Respects, fitted to be the anointed Saviour of the World, until the Word was made Flesh, *i. e.* until the Word did take our Flesh and whole Nature into a personal Union with himself, the which was necessary to the compleat Performance of his Mediatory Offices, of King, Priest, and Prophet, and especially of his Priestly Office.

And not only *G. W.* hath denyed Christ to have any created Body, whereof he consists, but he hath denyed that he hath any created Soul, in his Answer to *T. Danson's Synopsis*, p. 18. *As to T. Danson's telling of the Son of God's Incarnation, the Creation of his Body and Soul, the Parts of that Nature he subsisted in, &c. To this I say, if the Body and Soul of the Son of God were both created, doth not this render him a fourth Person? For Creation was in Time, which contradicts their Doctrine of three distinct, increated, coeternal, coessential Persons in the Deity, seeing that which was created, was not so: But herein, whether doth not his, and their Ignorance of the only begotten of the Father, and their Denial of Christ's Divinity, plainly appear, yea or nay? Where doth the Scripture say, that his Soul was created? For was not he the Brightness of his Father's Glory, and the express Image of his Divine Substance? But supposing the Soul of Christ, was, with the Body, created in time; I ask, if from Eternity he was a Person distinct from God and his holy Spirit, without either Soul or Body, and where doth the Scripture speak of any Person without either Soul or Body?* *T. Elwood*, to cover this gross Error of *G. W.* in his pretended Answer to my first Narrative, saith, *That G. W. only denyed that Christ had a created Soul, as God*: But this was not the State of the Question, for neither *T. D.* nor any other Man, were ever so gross as to affirm, that Christ as God, had a created Soul: And the like Evasion doth *G. W.* use himself, in his *Antidote*, p. 191. *This Question* (saith he) *is no Determination, that it was, or was not Christ; as God, his Soul was increated; as Man, his Soul or Spirit was not the Deity, but formed and assumed by the Word*: But it's Evident, that his accusing *T. D.* and others of Ignorance, for saying, it was created, determines it sufficiently.

But as is above said, *G. W.* and his Brethren will have only the Godhead to be the Christ, which they call, *The Heavenly Man*, having Soul and Body, Flesh, Blood, and Bones, uncreated, and existing from all Eternity, which they call, *The Seed within them, the Seed of the Woman that bruiseth the Serpent's Head*, which *G. F.* (as is above quoted) denyeth to be a Creature: *What the Seed spoke in him*, he said, *he spoke it not as a Creature*; therefore, that Heavenly Man, or Seed, consisting of Heavenly Flesh and Blood, which they say is in them, not being a Creature, must needs, in their Sense, be from all Eternity, and not from the Beginning of the World only. This appears yet more fully from *R. Hubberthorn*.

When was that Christ created, which you say must, as a Creature, judge the World? And if in Mary's Time, who was Judge of the World till then? Was not the Person of Christ Jesus before the World was? [Note, here he owns Christ to be a Person; and by *G. W's* Argument above mentioned, he must, being a Person, have both Soul and Body before the World was.] *And when had the Man, Christ Jesus, his Beginning? If you can declare it, how is Christ the only begotten Son of God, if he be a Creature? Or how can God beget a Creature? And if the whole Person of Christ was not before the Earthly Adam, how was the Creation made by him, or how can he be of the Nature of fallen Adam, and not Earthly and defiled, and is the Flesh of Christ Heavenly or Earthly, or is he Christ without his Flesh?* Coll. p. 49, 50.

Agreeable to this, is the Doctrine of both *G. W.* and *E. B.* *G. Whitehead* doth severely blame *John Horne* and *T. Muir*, for saying, *That Christ took upon him their Nature*; He Goes Horn, p. 11, 12.

ſture: And though they did well diſtinguiſh betwixt *our Nature, as in it it is corrupt by Sin* [*ſince the Fall*] *and as in Chriſt not corrupt and filthy*; yet by no means will he allow this Diſtinction, nor will he allow, *That it's one and the ſame Nature in the Gentiles, by which they did the things contained in the Law, and by which they broke the Law*; and he makes the ſinful Nature and the pure Nature, to be two Natures; this agrees with G. F's Doctrine afterwards quoted, *That the Nature in us that doth the Will of God, is Chriſt the Seed, but the Nature in us that ſinneth, is the Devil, the Serpent, the Luſt*; ſo that there is nothing in Mens Bodies, but Chriſt, or God, and the Devil, the Serpent, Sin, and Luſt; there is no reaſonable created Soul in Men, that at one time ſinneth, and afterwards is cleanſed from Sin, and obeyeth the Will of God, yet ſtill remaining one and the ſame Nature, in Eſſence and Subſtance.

Next let us hear *E. Bur.* in his *Collection*, p. 301. *Thou ſayeſt, in that Anſwer, that Chriſt aſcended to the Right Hand of the Father in your Nature. Mark now thy Nature and your Nature, who are one with thee, is ſinful and wicked, and of the Devil, for ſo are all Liers, and it is Blaſphemy to ſay, ſinful, wicked, deviliſh Nature, ſuch as* John Bunion's *is, and his Fellows, is at the Right Hand of God in Heaven. Oh Horrible!*

Again, he ſaith, p. 306. *That Chriſt aſcended into Heaven in our Nature*, viz. *in his Nature, and they that are one with him, and he and they are proved to be in corrupt Nature, as they will confeſs it: O what Wickedneſs is it to hold forth, That Chriſt is at the Right Hand of God in ſinful Nature, as his Words hold forth from his own Mouth.*

Note, His Opponent did not ſay, *ſinful Nature*, but *our Nature*: But ſeeing *E. B.* makes them both one, that it cannot be our Nature that Chriſt hath in Heaven, except it be ſinful Nature: This is to make Sin to be eſſential to our Nature, which is a moſt vile and groſs Hereſie, and agrees with that above mentioned, of G.F. and G. W. *That there are but two Natures in Man's Body, the one that is divine, and of God's Eſſence, that neither doth nor can ſin; the other of the Devil, that ſinneth and can do no good*: So there is no Soul left in Man, that is neither God nor the Devil, nor any Part of either by theſe Mens Doctrine.

But what doth G. W. and his Brethren then ſay to W. *Penn*, in his *Primitive Chriſtianity*, where he ſaith, p. 85. *That we do, we bleſs God, religiouſly believe and confeſs, to the Glory of God the Father, and the Honour of his dear and beloved Son, that Jeſus Chriſt took our Nature upon him, and was like unto us in all things, Sin excepted?* And p. 87. *We ſay, that he then overcame our common Enemy, foiled him in the open Field* [viz. *at his Death*] *and in our Nature triumphed over him that had overcome and triumphed over it, in our Forefather* Adam, *and his Poſterity; and that as truly as Chriſt overcame him in our Nature in his own Perſon*, &c.

But poſſibly, ſome will ſay, W. P. by our Nature, did mean the Quakers Nature, which is not ſinful; but not the Prieſts Nature, which is ſinful. But firſt, was not the Quakers Nature once ſinful, as really as the Nature of other Men? And doth no Sin cleave to the Nature of any Quaker at this Day? But ſecondly, W. P. tells us, *Our Nature, which Chriſt took, was that, over which our common Enemy had triumphed in our Forefather* Adam, *and his Poſterity*. Now, except the Quakers will ſay, *They are none of* Adam's *Poſterity*, they muſt grant, that, according to W. P. Chriſt did take, not only the Nature of the Quakers, but the Nature of other Men, which hath been defiled by Sin, both in them and us. What ſhall we now ſay of the great Unity that the Teachers of the Quakers boaſt of, in Doctrine as well as in Spirit? Whereas we ſee, that what W. P. owns, as a Part of his and his Brethrens Faith, and for which, he ſaith, *They bleſs God*: E. Burrough, who was

owned

owned as a Prophet among them, and was in greater Repute, and more deserving then, than ever W. P. was, or now is: *E. B.* hath past Sentence on it, *That it is horrible Blasphemy*: For if Christ took our Nature, and triumphed over the common Enemy in our Nature, surely he rose from the dead in our Nature, and ascended into Heaven in our Nature, which *E. B.* hath judged to be Blasphemy and Wickedness.

Here I asked *John Whiting*, of which of these two Faiths he was, whether that of G. W. and *E. B.* who said, *Christ was not in Heaven in our Nature*; or that of W. P. who said, *Christ took our Nature, and triumphed in our Nature?* He replied, *He was of the Faith of both*: By which Answer he made himself very ridiculous, and obnoxious to the general Censure of the Auditory, who cried out against him, as at several other times, many cried out at his and his Brethrens Impertinencies and absurd Answers.

After the same manner doth W. *Penn* labour to excuse and cloak his and his Brethrens vile Heresie, *That he who died at* Jerusalem, *was not properly the Son of God*, as is set down at the End of *Truth and Innocency*, recommended by G. W. And W. P. thinks he has fairly defended himself, by what he formerly said, *viz. That he that laid down his Life, and suffered his Body to be crucified by the Jews, without the Gates of* Jerusalem, *is Christ, the only Son of the most High God. But to assert, the Body which suffered and died, was properly the entire Son of God; this brings him more under the Charge of making him but a meer Man, than us, who acknowledge him to be one with the Father, and of a Nature eternal and immortal.* But here are two Fallacies; one is, *He that laid down his Life, and suffered his Body to be crucified, is Christ, the only Son of the most High God*: But, by this *HE*, he means only the Godhead, or the Word: This is the entire Christ by his Doctrine, and this *HE* suffered his Body to be crucified; but how was it his Body? Not as any Part of the intire Christ, but only as a Vail or Garment; that is a Man's Garment, but is no Part of him. The other Fallacy is, that he would cast it upon his Opponents, that they held, *The Body that suffered, was properly the entire Son of God, which were to make him but a meer Man.* But none of his Opponents said, That that Body, without the Soul of the Manhood, and without the Godhead of the Word, was the entire Christ; nor could it be so much as meer Man, *without a Soul, even a created Soul belonging to it.* Truth and Ion. p. 72.

Whether Christ's coming in the Flesh was a Figure.

THE next thing I charge to be a vile Error in the Quakers Books, especially G. F. and G. W. *That Christ's coming in the Flesh, and his Sufferings without us, in the Flesh, and his outward Flesh and Blood was a Figure, and But a Figure of Christ, and what he suffered in us, and of his Blood shed in us.*

This being charged in *Saul's Errand*, That R. Hubberthorn, writ, *That Christ's coming in the Flesh was but a Figure.*

It is answered, in *Saul's Errand*, in two several Places; first, in p. 8. thus; *Christ, in his People, is the Substance of all Figures, Types, and Shadows, fulfilling them in them, and setting them free from them; but as he is held forth in the Scripture Letter without them, and in the Flesh without them, to be a meer Example, or Figure, which is both one, that the same things must be fulfilled in them, that were in Christ Jesus*, for which he quotes 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. 1 *Pet.* 4. 1. 1 *Pet.* 1. 15. *Job.* 13. 15. Again, in *Saul's Err.* p. 14.

P. 14. Q. *Whether Christ in the Flesh be a Figure or not, and if a Figure, how, and in what?* Anſ. *Christ is the Subſtance of all Figures, and his Fleſh is a Figure, for every one paſſeth through the ſame way as he did, who comes to know Christ in the Fleſh; there muſt be a ſuffering with him, before there be a rejoycing with him: Christ is an Example for all to walk after, and if thou kneweſt what an Example is, thou wouldſt know what a Figure is, To come up to the ſame Fulneſs.*

Note, Had *R. Hubb.* and *G. F.* taught, That Chriſt is our Example, and if by Example, they only meant to be our Example, to follow him in the Virtues of Love, Humility, Self-denial, Patience, Reſignation, *&c.* none would have blamed them, but what they talk of his being ſuch an Example, is but mainly to hide their vile Hereſie: *For firſt*, ſaith *G. F. Chriſt is an Example for all to walk after*, to come up to the ſame Fulneſs: No ſound Chriſtian ever taught ſo, for the Apoſtles never taught, That they, or any other were, by following Chriſt's Example, *to come up to the ſame Fulneſs*; but ſtill ſpoke of the Meaſure, as with reſpect to all others. To come up to the ſame Fulneſs, is to come to be as much Chriſt as he was; and according to *VV. Penn*, ſee his Preface to *R. B's Collection*, the Paſſage quoted in my third Narrative, p. 10. atteſted, *&c. The VVork of Regeneration is a greater Myſtery, than God manifeſt in the Fleſh without us:* And ſaith *G. F. Chriſt, in his People, is the Subſtance of all Figures, Types, and Shadows, fulfilling them in them; and his Fleſh is a Figure.* Now, that by *Figure* or *Example*, they meant, not only or indeed ſo much, that he is our Example in holy living and walking, which none ever found fault with, of any called Chriſtians; but that, as he was outwardly born, was crucified, had his Blood ſhed, was buried, roſe and aſcended; ſo he is inwardly born, and has been crucified in the Quakers, and all other Saints, buried, riſen, and aſcended, and is King, Prieſt, and Prophet in them; and *G. VV's Light and Life*, p. 44. *Chriſt in them offers up himſelf in the Nature of a mediating Sacrifice, to appeaſe the VVrath of God; That not the outward Blood, that was outwardly ſhed, is the Blood of God, by which he purchaſed his Church, but God being a Spirit, his Blood, his inward and ſpiritual*, as *G. VV.* hath expreſly affirmed in his *Light and Life*, p. 44. And *VV. P.* in his *Rejoinder* to *J. Faldo*, p. 336, 337. comparing Chriſt his dying as a Malefactor, by his Death to reconcile us to God, to what was to be accompliſhed in Man, ſaith, *'Tis ſtrange that ſhould be reputed moſt miſterious, which was the Introduction to the Miſtery, and thoſe Tranſactions counted moſt difficult, that were, by the divine VVisdom of God, ordained, as ſo many facile Repreſentations of what was to be accompliſhed in Man*, &c. And a little before, comparing the outward with the inward, in Relation to Chriſt, he ſaith, *The Hiſtory is made the greateſt Miſtery*, which he blames in *J. Faldo*, for making Chriſt without us, a greater Miſtery than Chriſt within us; ſo that whether by Figure or Example, the Quakers mean the ſame thing, it is horribly offenſive, that Chriſt without us, and what he did and ſuffered without us, is ſuch an Example, as is to be wrought and accompliſhed in us by a greater Miſtery, ſo that the Work, or the thing wrought and effected, is greater and more excellent, than the Example according to which it is wrought; as the building ſome great Fabrick, the Example, Type, or Figure, according to which it is built, is made perhaps of Wood or Paſt-board, in a ſmall Model; whereas the Fabrick is great, and conſiſting of rich and very precious Materials. Thus they imagine the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt within them, above his Death and Sacrifice without them; and well they may, if Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood within them be immortal and from all Eternity, and that Chriſt's material Blood on the Croſs, was the Type of Chriſt's inward and

ward and ſpiritual Blood he had from all Eternity; for the Word, *Example*, in this caſe, is fully as offenſive as *Figure*, and can ſignifie no other than Figure; for if there be any ſuch inward and ſpiritual Blood of Chriſt, and Fleſh that he had from all Eternity, and if the material Blood be the Example of it, and Chriſt's material Fleſh the Example of that Heavenly increated Fleſh: It muſt needs be granted, that the thing exemplified, is greater than the Example of it, in the caſe, and the ſhedding of that Heavenly Blood which Chriſt had from all Eternity, and which was ſhed in *Adam* when he ſinned, is more excellent than the ſhedding of that material Blood which is but its Figure, according to them.

But now let us hear how *G. VV.* firſt defends himſelf, and next *VV. P.* in his *Truth and Inn.* p. 53. He gives a lame Quotation, objected againſt him, out of his *Truth defending the Quakers*: *Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh was but a Figure*, i. e. *a Figure or Type of the inward Chriſt, or Light within*: Here is a lame Quotation, which at full is thus, *Truth defend.* p. 21.

Did R. Hubberth. *well in writing, That Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh was but a Figure?*

Anſ. *Could Chriſt have been ſaid to have been tranſfigured, if his coming in the Fleſh had not been a Figure or Example*, till his Glory was revealed? *And haſt thou not read, That he was the expreſs Figure of his Father's Subſtance, inſtead of which, it is tranſlated, he is the expreſs Image*, &c.

Note, This Quotation was objected in a late printed Sheet, called *An Account from* Colcheſter: And a pretended Anſwer was given to it in another printed Paper, ſigned by ſeven Quakers of *Colcheſter*: And the like Anſwer is given by *G. VV.* in his *Truth and Innocency*, p. 53. *They abuſe me ſtill in this* (ſaith he) *it was none of my Aſſertion*, That Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh, was but a Figure: *I poſitively diſown theſe Words, as a downright Forgery put upon me. Anſ.* How can he in Conſcience diſown theſe Words, and charge them to be a downright Forgery put upon him, when in his Anſwer to that Charge againſt *R. Hubb.* he finds no Fault with the Phraſe, *But a Figure*, but brings two Places of Scripture to juſtifie it, which are moſt ignorantly and impertinently brought to prove it? Why did he not then except againſt the Word, *But a Figure*? But inſtead of excepting againſt it, he brings two Scriptures to prove the Aſſertion alledged againſt *R. Hubb.* the one is, That Chriſt was ſaid to have been *tranſfigured*; which, becauſe it ſounded in Engliſh like his being made a *Figure*, therefore, in his great Ignorance of the Word *Tranſfigured*, as well as of the Senſe intended, he thought it was a good Proof, that Chriſt, as he came in the Fleſh, was *but a Figure*; but *tranſfigured* there ſignifies nothing other but tranſformed; the Greek Word has no Relation, either to Figure or Example, for it is *μεταμορφώθη*, *i. e.* Metamorphoſed, a Word ſome uſe in Engliſh; and what that Tranſfiguration was, *Matthew* tells us, *Mat.* 17. 2. that *His Face did ſhine as the Sun, and his Raiment was white as the Light*: Now what Relation has this, either to *Figure* or *Example*, in that Senſe for which G. W. brought it to prove *R. Hubb's* Saying, Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh, was *but a Figure*? Of what was Chriſt's Tranſfiguration a Figure? Or how was it our Example to follow? But that G. W. meant not an Example of Imitation, but a *Type* or *Figure* that was to *vaniſh* or be laid aſide, is evident from his own Words; 'Could Chriſt have been ſaid 'to have been tranſfigured, if his coming in the Fleſh had not been a Figure or Ex-'ample, *till his Glory was revealed?* Thus we ſee how long G. W. thought that Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh was to continue a Figure, viz. *until his Glory ſhould be re-*

revealed; to wit, by his inward coming into the Hearts of the Disciples, which was the Substance of that Figure; for thus G. W. and his Brethren argue for the Disuse of outward Baptism and the Supper; they were but Figures of the inward Substance, and were to continue but until that was revealed; so here Christ's coming in the Flesh, was but a Figure till his Glory was revealed: So whether G. W. makes it Figure or Example, he tells us how long it was to be our Figure or Example, *till his Glory was revealed.* But taking Example, for an Example that we ought to follow, in all holy living and walking, we shall find the Scriptures set him forth for our Example after his Glory was revealed, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. *Because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an Example, that ye should follow his Steps:* this was after his Glory was revealed in and among the Believers.

And as the Quakers Reason why they cast off outward Baptism and the Supper is, because the Substance is revealed in them, whereof they were Figures; so for the same reason, they think Christ's Death at *Jerusalem* is not to be minded nor preached, because it was a Figure, *Christ in his People is the Substance of all Figures*: *And his Flesh is a Figure*: Here Figure in both Places hath the same Signification: He doth not say, Christ *without* his People, but Christ *in* his People is the *Substance of all Figures.* And as a Proof of this, a Quotation was brought against the Quakers out of one of their ancient Books, called, *The Doctrine of Perfection vindicated*; *So when you come to know this* [to wit, the Operation of Christ, or the Light within] *you will cease remembring his Death at* Jerusalem, *and will come to see how he hath been crucified in you, and what it is that hath crucified him.* Thus we see, how, according to him, Christ's Death at *Jerusalem* being but a Figure of Christ crucified within the Substance; the Use and Remembrance of it ceaseth. Is not this horrid Blasphemy? Why have they not all this time retracted this?

To this *G. W.* answers, *Truth and Inn.* p. 55. *I do not believe this to be justly or impartially quoted, let them produce it at large, and whose it is.* But the Book being produced, it did appear to be justly and impartially quoted, and the Book to be a Quakers Book, and printed for *R. Wilson*, the Quakers Bookseller at that time; the Author's Name is *John Whitehouse*, who shews how, and by whom he was brought over to Quakerism.

But let us see, how that other Place of Scripture, brought by G. W. to prove *R. H.* his Assertion, That *Christs coming in the Flesh is but a Figure*, will clear him, or rather indeed render him guilty of the same Error with *R. H.* the Place is most impertinently quoted by G. W. to prove, That Christ's coming in the Flesh, was either a Figure or Example for us to follow, as he would have us to understand him; That by Christ's coming in the Flesh, his being a Figure, that is, an Example of our Imitation, *Truth and Inn.* p. 24, 25. *Heb.* 1. 3. Christ is there called, *The Brightness of his* (viz. God's) *Glory, and the Express Image of his Person*; and this G. W. brought to confirm *R. H's* Assertion, telling us, from his pretended great Learning, that he is the *express Figure*; instead of which, he saith, it is translated, *express Image.* And he is at great Pains to shew, that Type or Figure sometimes points at a thing to come, sometimes it denotes a present Example, and that either of Imitation, or of Warning and Caution: But how can he make it appear, That by the Description given of Christ, *Heb.* 1. 3. his being the express Image of his (*viz.* the Father's) Person, that Christ is there set forth to be our Example, either for Imitation or Caution, for he is not there said to be *our Example* or Image, but the *Χαρακτηρ*, (as it is in the Greek) of the Father's *Person* or *Hypostasis*: But the Word *Character*, can

can no wise justly here be understood to be an Example of our Imitation; and G. W. was but idle, to render it Figure, to quadrate with R. H's Assertion, and to make the ignorant think he could mend the Translation, but his now turning it to Example, makes it Blasphemy, as to say, The Son is an Example of Imitation or Caution for the Father to follow; it had been more agreeable to have said, The Father is an Example of the Son, for the Son to follow, than to say, The Son is an Example for the Father to follow, seeing Christ said, *I can do nothing of my self, for what I see the Father do, that do I.* But to give an Instance what an Ambidexter G. W. is, in twisting and twining and bending the Scripture. In his *Antidote*, p. 191. he saith, That *He spoke for Christ's Divinity*, as he was the Brightness of the Father's Glory, and the express Image of his divine Substance, *in Answer to* T. Danson. Here he forsaketh his former Translation, which was *Figure*, and taketh the Translation in our English Bible, which is *Image*. But how will this prove the Divinity of Christ, so as to be one Substance with the Father, if the express Image signifie our *Example of Imitation*, as G. W. doth argue in his *Truth and Innocency*? His being an Example of our Imitation, is no sufficient Argument to prove his being one Substance with the Father; for the Socinians will grant him to be a very excellent Example of our Imitation, yet this is no sufficient Argument to convince them, That he is one Substance with the Father, from his being an Example of Imitation. Is it not plain, from all this shuffling and shifting, that G. W. rather than he will confess his former Errors, will wrong his own Conscience, and bring the most nonsensical Excuses that ever were heard of, to defend his Infallibility, than give Glory to God by a plain and free Confession of his Errors?

Next let us hear G. W's Defence of that Saying of W. P's; *One outward thing cannot be the proper Figure or Representation of another; the outward Lamb shews forth the inward Lamb.* He labours to vindicate W. P's Saying, by thus arguing, *How will these Men* (saith he) *prove that the outward Paschal Lamb was the proper Figure or Representation of Christ's outward Person? Pray what proper Resemblance had they? Was not rather the Lamb, in respect of its Innocency, a proper Figure of Christ's Innocency, as the Lamb of God once offered for Sin?* I answer, And was not the Lamb's Innocency an outward thing, *i. e.* without Men, and also Christ's Innocency, as he lived and walked among Men, and was not his outward Person innocent? But had not G. W. been extreamly blind and ignorant, he had never argued nor asked so foolishly, what proper Resemblance had they, *viz.* the Paschal Lamb, and Christ's outward Person; for the Generality of Christians know, that as by God's Appointment, the Paschal Lamb and Sacrifices, were proper Types and Figures of Christ's outward Person, as he was to be slain for the Sins of the World; so the Resemblance was not only in Innocency, but in many other Respects; the Lamb was to be killed so was Christ; the Lamb was to be without Blemish, so was Christ; the Lamb was to be of the Flock, so was Christ to be of his Brethren; the Blood of the Lamb sprinkled on the Door-posts and Lintels of the Israelites, saved them from the Wrath of the destroying Angel, so the Blood of Christ, that was outwardly shed, applyed by Faith, saveth true Believers from Wrath; the Lamb was to be eaten wholly, so we are to receive Christ wholly, in all his Offices: These and many other Resemblances there are betwixt the Paschal Lamb and Christ, known in general to Christians, yea, to many Children, which yet G. W. here declares himself to seem wholly ignorant of. *Godwin*, in his Book called *Moses* and *Aaron*, numbers at least twelve Particulars of Resemblance, betwixt the Paschal Lamb and Christ without

us,

us, and yet this G. W. more like a Heathen than a Chriſtian, queries, *Pray what proper Reſemblance had they?* But to return his Queſtion, *Pray what proper Reſemblance had the Paſchal Lamb to the inward Blood Chriſt, which,* G. W. ſaith, *is the Life and Light and Spirit of God within, and the Holy Ghoſt?* Was ever the Holy Ghoſt, or the Godhead ſlain in Men? Or is there an inward ſpiritual Blood of Chriſt ſlain in Men, that is not the Godhead? But we ſhall come anon to treat more fully of this: And how is that fulfilled in Chriſt within, A Bone of him ſhall not be broken?

Whether Chriſt without us, as he died and roſe again, is the Object of Faith, &c.

G. *W.* Truth and Inn. p. 54. defends a moſt Antichriſtian Saying of his in his *Light and Life*, and to cloak it the more, he gives the Quotation lame. The Quakers at *Colcheſter*, in their late printed Paper, called, *Some Account*, gives it more fully: But in the Book, *Light and Life*, p. 38. it is thus; Bapt. *Now the Quakers would be ſo far from directing Men to go to the material Temple, that they make it but a vain thing to look to* Jeruſalem, *to the Antitype of that Temple*, viz. *to Jeſus, as he was there crucified, or to that* Blood *that was there ſhed for Juſtification.*

His Anſwer is, *The Quakers ſee no need of directing Men to the Type for the Antitype*; viz. *neither to the outward Temple, nor yet to* Jeruſalem, either to Jeſus Chriſt or his Blood, *knowing that neither the Righteouſneſs of Faith, nor the Word of it, does ſo direct,* Rom 10. *And is it the Baptiſts Doctrine to direct Men to the material Temple and* Jeruſalem, *the Type for the Antitype? What Nonſenſe and Darkneſs is this? And where do the Scriptures ſay, That the* Blood *was there ſhed for Juſtification, and that Men muſt be directed to* Jeruſalem, *whereas that Blood ſhed, is not in being?* p. 40. *But the true Apoſtles directed them to the Light, which was ſo much oppoſed by the Baptiſts, to walk in the Light, for the Blood of Chriſt to cleanſe them from all Sin.*

Now let us hear his Defence, *Truth and Inn.* p. 54. *I ask theſe Men* (ſaith he) *where the Scripture doth ſo direct Men to go to the outward Temple at* Jeruſalem *for Jeſus Chriſt? Nay, doth it not contrarywiſe direct them? See plain Scripture*, Deut. 30. 12, 13, 14. Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8. The ſame Anſwer in effect, but in more Words, quoting at full length, *Deut.* 30. 12, 13, 14. and *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. we find in that called, *Some Account from* Colcheſter, ſigned by ſeven Quakers there (but likely enough to have been drawn up by *G. W.* himſelf, though whether it was or not, is not material to the caſe) and on the Margin they ſay, *Muſt they then go on Pilgrimage?*

Note, This is a moſt ſhameful Evaſion to cloak their vile Hereſie, of which, yet to this very Day, G. W. hath not plainly cleared himſelf, nor ever can, till he retract this and his many other Errors. Can it be ſuppoſed, that W. *Burnet*, who was the Baptiſt that thus objected againſt the Quakers, was for having the Quakers or any others, go on Pilgrimage, or on Feet to *Jeruſalem* for Jeſus Chriſt or his Blood? G. W. knoweth, in his Conſcience, the contrary; yea, in the Lines immediately going before the Quotation, W. *Burnet* clears the matter, That he was not for having People go on Pilgrimage to *Jeruſalem*, either for Chriſt or to Chriſt. W. *Burnet*, in his *Capital Principles*, p. 24. Iſrael *of old* (he ſaith) *were commanded to go up to the literal Temple at* Jeruſalem *to worſhip, but now God's Worſhippers may worſhip him, each one in his Reſpective Place.* Yea, G. W. in his *Light and Life*, takes

takes that to be W. *Burnet's* Sense, That Christ was to be sought and found at such a Distance by Faith, and yet he still objects against Christ sought at a Distance without us, even by Faith, as in Heaven above the Clouds, or as he suffered at *Jerusalem: I ask* (saith he) *if the* Object *or Foundation of the Faith he divided from the* Faith? From which reasoning, it is evident he is against Christ, as without us, as at a distance, either as he suffered at *Jerusalem*, or as he is now in Heaven, to be the Object of our Faith.

And whereas, in that called *Some Account from* Colchester, they quote *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. and set down the Words at full Length, why do they not quote and set down the Words in p. 9, 10. *That if thou shall confess with thy Mouth, the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine Heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* By all the things that have been objected against G. W. to move him to give some confession of his Faith in the Man Christ, as he suffered and rose again without us, and is now in Heaven without us, in that very created Nature of the Soul and Body of Man he had on Earth, as in Union with the eternal Word, and that as such, he is the great Object of our Faith, for Remission of Sin, yet he cannot be drawn to it, which still shews he remains in his vile Antichristian Doctrine. As to his seeming Confession to Christ without, in his Supplement to the Switch, we shall see ere long in its Place.

In his *Truth and Inn.* p. 54. he seeks to excuse *W. P's* Saying, in his *Quakerism a new Nick-name*, p. 6. *Faith in Christ's outward Manifestation, has been a deadly Poison these later Ages has been infected with.* G. W's Defence is, *'Tis making Faith in the History thereof, that is in Opposition to his Power and Work in the Soul, and to Godly living*, as is evident in the Place quoted. But did *J. Faldo*, *W. P's* Opponent, make Faith in Christ's outward Manifestation, in Opposition to his Power and Work in the Soul? Nay surely, nor did any other of their Opponents teach such Doctrine.

But this is the common way of G. W. and his Brethren, to cloak their own vile Errors, they will misrepresent their Opponents Principles: It's sufficiently evident, from G. W's Doctrine, that he has all along opposed Faith in Christ's outward Manifestation, as necessary to Salvation, and it will yet further appear.

Again, he excuses *W. P's* Saying, *Truth and Inn.* p. 55. *And since they believe that outward Appearance* [i.e. *of Jesus at* Jerusalem] *they need not preach what is to be again*; by telling us, he means, *They need not always preach it where it is believed*; and confesseth all true Quakers own that visible Appearance of Christ.

Note, this is an evidently apparent Strain; W. P's Reason why the Quakers need not preach Christ's outward Appearance, as he suffered Death was, that it was not to be again, which makes it unnecessary to be preached. But this Liberty of G. W. and *J. Wyeth*, and others, of adding and taking away material Words, is so intolerable, where the plain Sense will bear no such Addition, nor taking away, that all this rate nothing so false, but shall be made to seem true.

But why need they not always to preach it? Suppose the Quakers believe it, do not they preach always the Light within, and do not the Quakers generally believe it, and divers other Principles they profess? How shall their Children have the Faith of it without preaching? Doth the Light within so teach it, that they have it without preaching? But how do they believe it? Only hystorically: It is no necessary Article of their Faith to be preached or believed to Salvation; the Light within is sufficient to Salvation without any thing else.

The

The like Fallacy and Sophistry he useth to excuse *W. Shewen's* Saying, *Not to Jesus, the Son of* Abraham, David, *and* Mary, *but to God the Father, all Worship, Honour and Glory is to be given.* But to hide his Fallacy, he gives a lame Quotation. The Words being, *Not to Jesus, the Son of* Abraham, David, *and* Mary, *nor to Saint nor Angel, but to God the Father.* he saith, he knows his Intent was, *Not to Jesus* only, *as the Son of* Abraham: But then if the Word *Only* must be added, as explanatory to one Part of the Sentence, it must be added to the other Part of the same Sentence and so it will run thus, Not to Jesus the Son of *Abraham, David, Mary*, nor to Saint and Angel *only*, but to God the Father all Worship, *&c.* Is not this a fair Excuse, by which, to cover their vile Heresie, they will run into Popish Idolatry, they are not to give Worship to Saints and Angels only, but to God.

Note, G. W. writes this contrary to what he knoweth in his Conscience to be true, for he was present at that Meeting in *London*, 1678. where *W. S.* and others blamed me for praying to Jesus Christ, in the Passage above quoted in my Book, called *The Way cast up*, &c. Beside, it was no Part of the Controversie betwixt the Quakers and the Church of *England* or Dissenters, That Christ was to be prayed to only as the Son of *Abraham.*

But is *G. W.* now in good earnest, in thus excusing *W. S?* Is he for giving divine Worship to Jesus the Son of *Abraham, David*, and *Mary*, in any respect, seeing he hath denied that the true Jesus did consist of a Body of Flesh and Bone, or that he hath a created Soul and Body, as above quoted.

But let us once more hear how he excuseth that Passage of *W. Penn*, his *Address to Protestants*, p. 119. 'Let us but soberly consider what Christ is, and we shall the 'better know whether moral Men are to be reckoned Christians; what is Christ 'but Meekness, Justice, Mercy, Patience, Charity, and Virtue in Perfection? *G. W.* saith, '*W. P.* did not design thereby to lessen the Power or Dignity of Christ, 'who is the Author of these Virtues, no more than the Apostles did in saying, He '(Christ) is made of God unto us, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Re'demption (spoken in the Abstract) and the Prophet saying, God is my Light and 'my Salvation, though God and Christ also be the Author of Redemption and Salva'tion.

This is also a sophistical Evasion; when *Paul* said, *Christ was made of God unto us, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption*; he means not the Light within, as it is in meer moral Heathens, but so *W. P.* meant also: but *Paul* did really mean Jesus of *Nazareth*, who is both God and Man, the Word made Flesh, as is clear from the foregoing Words, even Christ crucified, as being the Author of those Graces, Blessings, and Virtues, unto all sincere Believers in him, by bestowing on them his holy Spirit, to indue them with Wisdom and Sanctification, and freely imputing his Righteousness that he wrought in his own Person without them, for their Justification and Redemption: Also *David* in calling the Lord his Light and Salvation, had a Respect to God in Christ, even the Man Christ, who was to come out of his Loins, as the Object of his Faith for Redemption and Salvation. But the whole Tendency of *W. P.*'s Discourse in that Passage, and in other Passages, going before and following, is to perswade that Men are Christians, if they have these moral Virtues, without Faith in Christ, as he was outwardly crucified; for, in the Enumeration of these Virtues, he has not the least Word of Faith in Christ crucified, as necessary to Christianity, but pleads for a false Notion of the Christian Faith, p. 118. *As he that believes in Christ, believes in God, so he that believes in God, believes in Christ*;

Christ: Thus, making Faith in Christ to be nothing else but a Belief in God, as a Creator, without any Respect to Christ crucified. And p. 119. a little after that scandalous Passage above quoted, he saith, *Christians ought to be distinguished by their Likeness to Christ, and not their Notions of Christ*; which is likewise scandalous, as implying that Men may be like Christ, without true Notions of him and Faith in him [illegible]t, Christ Jesus of *Nazareth*, that died and rose again; yea, he pleads, p. 118. *that a meer just Man ought not to be excluded the Communion of Christians, and that to exclude him, is partial and cruel.* And at this rate, professed Infidel Jews and Mahumetans, if they be but meer just Men, are to be received into Christian Society as good Christians, indeed good enough to be Members of the Quakers Church.

But now let us see how the following scandalous Passages, quoted out of G. *W*'s own Books, are defended by the *Colchester* Quakers, in that they call *Some Account from* Colchester.

Some Account from Colchester, p. 11. When you tell us you have Faith in Christ, do you mean Christ, whose Person is now ascended into Heaven above the Clouds, or do you mean only a Christ within you? Ans. (saith G. *W.*) *Here thou would make two Christs, a Christ whose Person is above the Clouds, and a Christ within; but how provest thou two such Christs? We have Faith in that Christ that descended from the Father, who is the same that ascended far above all Heavens; and this Christ we witness in us, who is not divided.*

Note, in their Vindication of this Passage they say, *This Answer appears pertinent to detect and reprehend an impertinent and foolish Question, which, whether it does not imply two Christs, let the serious judge, from the natural Import and Sense of the Question in the disjunctive Part of it; or do you only mean a Christ within you?* Here their pretended Grammatical Skill of the Term *disjunctive*, fails them.

To ask the Question disjunctively, implies no more two Christs, than it implies two *George Whiteheads*, to ask, Is *George Whitehead* a Londoner born, or a North Country Man, born in the North of *England*; this doth not imply two G. *Whiteheads*: But if one should say, *George Whitehead* was born in the North of *England* some 64 Years ago, and since that, was born in *London*; this would import two G. *Whiteheads* very plainly: And no less indeed do the Quakers wild Notions that many of them have printed, even the Men of great Note among them, import not only two Christs, but many Christs, even thousands; and they have no way to extricate themselves of this Difficulty, but sophistical Evasions; for if ye ask them, Was that the true Christ who was born at *Bethlehem*, of a Virgin called *Mary*, above 1600 Years ago, and do they believe in that Christ? They will tell you yea; but they have this sophistical Sense, that he was the Light within, that Person that was outwardly born, who is by a Metonimy called Christ, the thing containing, for the thing contained: See W. *Penn*'s *Rejoinder*, p. 304, 305. *But that that outward Person was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny*, said W. P. as above quoted: But the most true and proper Christ, is the Christ born in them, and growing up in them from a holy thing or Seed, to a Child born, and then to the Mighty God; which three Steps are orderly set down by *W. B.* in his printed *Collection*, p. 291. See third narrative, p. 37.

And he tells who is the Virgin in whom this Child is born; not the Virgin *Mary*, but every Quaker, who is converted to the Light within: And because this Child is not born in them all at once, but at different times, as they witness the Work of Regeneration, and as many as come to witness Regeneration, as many regenerated

Persons there are in the World, as many times Christ is born; and though they say, *Christ is one in all*, and would defend their so saying by Scripture, yet they mean not as the Scripture means; for Christ, as he is God, is the same in all, and as he dwells in all the faithful, by his Spirit and by Faith, yet not so as that Christ is really and truly begotten and born in regenerate Persons without any Al[illegible], as they hold; for they make Christ, as born without the Figure and Al[illegible] and Christ as born within, &c. the Substance; and on Supposition, that the[illegible]e so many real Births of Christ, it is impossible they could be one Christ, otherwise than specifically one, though consisting of many Individuals, as many Individuals of Men are called Man, but they are not one numerical Man, no more can Christ be one numerical Christ, but many, if he were really begotten and born in many as they say he is: It's true, the Scripture speaks of Christ being formed in Believers, but this is a metaphorical Expression, and allegory, even as the Image of *Cæsar* on Gold or Silver, is called *Cæsar*; so the true lively Image of Christ, is called Christ, in true Believers, and that is the meaning of Christ formed in Believers, so that if they would be content with the allegorical Sense of the Word, Christ formed within, begotten and born within, as sound and sober Christians understand it, none would blame them; and that they laid no more Stress upon it than they should, but the contrary they do, so as to make the Christ thus born within, the greater Reality and Mystery, than Christ born without, and to make that inward Birth, to have no Dependence on Christ as born without us, and as he died for our Sins, and rose and ascended into Heaven, in the true intire Nature of Man, consisting of a created Soul and Body, and so as to witness the inward Work of Regeneration, to be without Faith in Christ, as without; and without all special Illumination and Operation of the Holy Ghost, as given only to Believers in Christ crucified: And to assert, That meer just Men, and moral Heathens, who have no Faith in Christ as outwardly crucified, to be as truly regenerate as the most sincere Believers; all this is really Antichristian.

And whether G. *W*'s following Discourse, in his *He-goats Horn*, p. 8. 9. compared with the like Passages in G. F's G. M. and elsewhere, I leave to intelligent Christians to consider, doth not really import many Christs really distinct, as really as the Persons are, in whom they say Christ is born, raised up, &c.

Whether the Seed of God, in Believers, be Christ, and the Seed of the Woman, and the Seed promised to Abraham *and* David.

G. *W.* He-goats Horn, p. 8. *As to our saying, That the Seed of God, which is Christ, where-ever he is known in such a low Measure as a Seed that suffers, and is burdened in Man by Corruption, there he desires to be free from the Burden of Sin, and always to do his Father's Will, and this Seed the Power reaches to, where it is begotten, and in the Power it arises in them that believe in the Light for their Redemption. They have shewed themselves ignorant of the Seed of God, which the Promise is to, and that they never knew the Work of that Power which reaches the Seed, as also they are ignorant of the Scriptures, for it is written,* Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing, [Note, this he understands of the Seed within, to be the Lamb slain, who

who hath redeemed Men by his Blood, to wit, the Blood of the Seed within, as G. F. calls it.] *Rev.* 5. 12. *So that they might as well have ſcoft at the Angels of God who ſpoke theſe Words, as at us,* [But the Angels ſpoke it not of a Seed within that needed Salvation or Redemption, but of the Man Chriſt without, as he was outwardly ſlain and roſe again] *and have ſaid, that the Power that reacheth to the Seed is Chriſt, and then Chriſt is worthy to receive Chriſt; as alſo they have done in their* Scorn, *in p.* 63. *wherein they have ſhewed their groſs Ignorance of the ſeveral Manifeſtations of Chriſt the Seed in his People, who are of the Seed of* Abraham, *which Chriſt took upon him to redeem his own, and to bring to his own Power and Promiſe which he receives of the Father.*

See again in another Book of *G. W.* &c. called, *A brief Diſcovery of the dangerous Principles of* John Horn, *&c.* p. 21. *A Quotation being taken out of* J. Naller's Love to the Loſt, *That the Seed to which the Promiſe was made, and which few know, is a certain Seed or Principle in Man, deſiring to follow after God, and to be free from Sin.* Reply, *Here you are ſeen to be ignorant of the Seed of God, and Enemies to it in his People, which Seed is Chriſt, and where-ever he is known in ſuch a low Meaſure as a Seed that ſuffers, and is burdened in Man by Corruption, there he deſires to be free from the Burden of Sin, and always to do his Father's Will; and this Seed the Power reaches to where it is begotten, and in the Power it ariſes in them that believe in the Light for their Redemption, and the Apoſtle travelled again for the* Galatians, *until Chriſt was formed in them, who firſt is known as one without Form or Comelineſs, and ſo the Seed of God ſuffers in ſome, and in others it reigns, and is known to be Prince of Peace: And this is no Miſtery of Deceit (as you ſay) but a Miſtery that hath diſcovered your Deceit, who know not the Seed of the Kingdom, nor the Power wherein it riſes: And have you never known what Chriſt is without the Camp? But before you who are Neglecters of Chriſt, and Abuſers of the Truth, can know the Seed of God, and what it is in you, you muſt come to the Light which condemns you for your Deceit and Lies, with which you have abuſed the Truth, and then learn to know what and where the Grave is which Chriſt hath made with the wicked.* Conformable to this *R. Hub.* ſaid in *He-goats Horn broken*, p. 62. *Chriſt the Seed made his Grave in the wicked, and in the rich in his Death, and out of that Grave, with his Body, riſeth into everlaſting Life; and if thou canſt receive it, thou mayeſt be ſatisfied.*

Again, in *He-goats Horn*, p. 50. *G. W.* quotes *J. Horn* thus; J. Horn *ſaith*, The Prophet Iſaiah *doth not witneſs*, That in them a Child was born, and in them a Son was given.

G. W. anſwers, *Chriſt was the firſt-born in many Brethren*, Rom. 8. 29. ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, *and was not* Iſaiah *one of theſe Brethren, who alſo had been as with Child*, Iſa. 26. 17. Jer. 30. 6.

Note, Thus by *G. W.* and *R. H.* we have an Account of Chriſt a Seed, buried in the wicked, ſuffering without the Camp, deſiring to be freed from Sin, and to do the Will of the Father, ſuffering in ſome, but reigning in others, begotten and born in them, raiſed in them, the which Seed is reached to by the Power which taketh hold of it, even the Seed of *Abraham*; and thus the chief Prophecies in the old Teſtament, concerning Chriſt's Birth of the Virgin, his Death, Burial, Reſurrection; *G. W.* hath applied to the Birth of the Seed within, and which he ſaith, ſuffers in ſome, and reigns in others, and ſo is neither begotten nor born in ſome, but is begotten and born in others. But how this can be underſtood all of one and the ſame numerical Seed or Chriſt, is fully as hard, as to underſtand how all Men in the World, both good and bad, are one numerical and individual Man. Nay, it is much hard-

er; for G. F. saith, *The Seed that spoke in him, and said he was Christ, was not a Creature; he spoke it not as a Creature, but out of and beyond all Creatures.* Now, that any thing can be begotten and born in time, yea, daily and hourly, as this Seed is daily begetting in some, and begotten and born in others, and yet not be a Creature, is not intelligible to Mens Understanding, by the highest Illumination they are capable of.

Whether was Christ incarnate more than once, or is he daily incarnate, &c.

NOTE, I produced a Quotation out of *E. Burrough*, To prove that Christ is daily incarnate, and incarnating in Men, as oft as Men are regenerated or regenerating; the which (though it was read in the Beginning of the third Meeting) because of its Affinity with what goes before on this Head, I shall here insert.

In *E. B's* Works, p. 29. a Question being proposed to the Quakers by *Philip Bennet*, Whether was the Word made Flesh, or the Son of God made of a Woman, more or oftner than once? After some Railing going before, he thus answers; *Thou dost not know, nor canst not witness the Word to be made Flesh once, but art one of the Antichrists and Deceivers which* John *speaks of, that are entred into the World, which cannot confess Jesus Christ come in the Flesh, and therefore thou queriest whether the Word was made Flesh any more or oftner than once? Which Query comes from thy dark polluted Mind, who is out of the Light.* And p. 30. *And when thou canst witness the Word to be made Flesh once, then thou wilt know whether the Son of God was made of a Woman, any more or oftner than once: But thou art the Dragon that would devour the Man-child which the Woman has brought forth, who shall rule all Nations with a Rod of Iron.*

Note, some Expositors on the Book of the *Revelation*, have, by the Woman, understood the Church, and by the Man-child, the Life of Christ, or Christ formed in true Belidvers, by way of Allegory and Metaphor only, as is above noted; but they never understood, that Christ, strictly speaking, without all Allegory or Metaphor, was ever begotten or born in time but once, or was ever made of a Woman but once, *viz.* when he was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the Womb of the Virgin, and born of her: But the chief Teachers among the Quakers, such as *G. F. G. W.* and *W. P.* and *E. B.* hath made Christ's Birth of the Virgin *Mary*, and his Death, and Sufferings, and Blood shed without them, the Type, and Allegory, and Christ born within, crucified within them, risen and ascended within them, the Reallity and greatest Mystery, as is above proved.

Like to this is another Passage in *G. Whitehead's Jacob found in a desert Land*, p. 6, 7. *And in Simplicity I was made to wait upon God, and to endure the Cross of Christ, though for a Time and Times, the Enmity of the wicked one was strong against me within and without, seeking to devour that Seed, which, thro' the Word of the Lord, was begotten in me. And the Misteries of God and his Kingdom was revealed in me, who brought me out of Darkness through the Wilderness where the Man-child was preserved,* for a Time and Times, and half a Time, *from the Wrath of the Dragon who would have slain the Man-child: But now is he arisen in his Power and Zeal, and the Prince of the World is cast out,* and he is born which is the everlasting Counseller, the Prince of Peace [quoting in the Margin *Isa.* 9. 6.] who hath sent War, and the Fire, and the Sword into the Earth.

Note,

Note, This I find was generally their manner of preaching and writing, both at their first Appearance and long after, to tell People that Christ was begotten in them, born in them, crucified, dead and buried, risen and ascended into Heaven within them; and that every one, in order to eternal Salvation, must know Christ thus begotten and born in them, crucified, dead, buried, risen and ascended; and this inward Conception and Birth of Christ, *&c.* they made the greatest Mistery and Reality, whereof Christ, as born without in the Flesh, was the Figure, *and a facile Representation* (to use *W. P.*'s Phrase in the case) *of what is to be transacted in us*, thus they did represent the *inward Work of Regeneration to be a greater Mistery than God manifest in the Flesh*, viz. *in that Body of Flesh that was born at* Bethlehem, as *W. P.* hath expresly affirmed, as is above quoted: And by this high sublime Doctrine, which they gave forth to be given them by immediate Revelation from Heaven (though it was no other but what *G. F.* had from some old Ranters and Familists, who had it long before him.) They did mightily magnifie themselves above all others, and cried out against all others, as dark ignorant Sots, Deceivers and Antichrists, who denied Christ come in the Flesh, because they did not receive this wild Notion they had got from Ranters and Familists, That Christ was born, crucified, dead, buried, risen and ascended in them; and though while I was with them, I was not altogether ignorant that they had such Phrases and Methods of Speech as I had read in some of their Books, yet I thought they understood it only by way of Allegory and Metaphor, as *Origen*, *Augustine*, &c. Some others of the Fathers, both Greek and Latine, used the like allegorical Phrases, and which I my self have partly used in some of my former Books, only by way of Allegory and Metaphor: But I appeal to all, who shall but impartially consider what I have above quoted out of their Books, whether they will not judge and say, that these Teachers of the Quakers, whose Words I have quoted, plainly import quite another thing than an allegorical Birth, Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ in them, even that which is real, without an Allegory, Metaphor, or Figure; for as *G. F.* said, in *Saul's Errand*, *Christ's Flesh is a Figure*, *and Christ in his People is the Substance of all Figures*; and consequently of that Figure also. Besides, if they meant it only by way of Allegory and Metaphor, why did they cry out against all others as Antichrists, Deceivers, blind and dark Sots, who did not receive this their Notion, but opposed it as antichristian? But if they had plainly told, that they meant it not otherwise but by way of Allegory and Metaphor, I know none that would have opposed them in that case. But as in some other things, after the Quakers have made a great Compass, and yet return to say the same with others, from whom they differed so in this very thing, after all that *G. W.* as much as any, had formerly contended for Christ begotten and born within, suffering within, his Blood shed within, being a Sacrifice within Men, to appease the Wrath of God, and giving much more to Christ thus born within, suffering within, his Blood shed within, than to Christ born without, this Blood shed without, being a Type of his Blood shed within: Yet in his *Judgment fixed*, printed 1682. which was 26 Years after his *Jacob found in a desert Land*, printed 1656. above quoted, he turns all that he had formerly writ and contended for, (Christ born within, suffering within, desiring to be freed from Sin) into an Elegancy of Speech, the Property and Effect being put for the Cause [which is no more, nor other than what all Christian Teachers and Expositors affirm:] For this hear what he saith in answer to his Opponent, *Jeffery Bullock*, who charged the Quakers with false Doctrine, in saying, *That God's Appearance is to his Son Jesus Christ*; and

and for the begetting and bringing him forth in the Sons and Daughters of Men, the which Doctrine, said *J. B. I do deny.* To this, *G. W.* after some foregoing Words, answereth, in his *Judgment fixed*, p. 330. *This innocent Birth, which God by his Spirit brings forth in the Sons and Daughters of Men, who truly believe, relate to them and their Souls, as begotten and born of the immortal Seed by the living Word, so that this Birth is not Christ Jesus* [What say the Quaker Zealots to this flat Denial of his own and his Brethrens former Doctrine, and yet this without any Change in him, he is the same infallible *G. W.* still] *for he is that incorruptible Seed and Word of Life, which begets Forms, and brings forth the Soul of Man into his own Nature and Image, and so he renews his own Image in Man that believes in his Power, and so Christ may be said to be formed in us,* as in a misterious and elegant way of speaking, *the Property and Effect being put for the Cause; for Christ, in himself, hath all Power in Heaven an Earth given to him, and it hath pleased the Father, that all Fullness should dwell in him.*

Again, in *Judgment fixed*, p. 322. *We deny the Doctrine that the Word, GOD, is in Bondage or Captivity in the Sons and Daughters of Men, but only that there is a Seed of God and of Christ that is opressed, and suffers in many by reason of Transgression. A Seed of God is commonly our Phrase and Terms in this case.* And p. 124. *These are certain Allusions and Elegancies.*

Note, this is expresly contradictory to what he hath frequently printed in his other Books, particularly to what is at great length quoted above out of his *He-goats Horn*, p. 8. and his *Brief Discovery*, p. 21. where he calls *the Seed that suffers within People, and that desires to be freed from Sin,* Christ; *and the Lamb that was slain, that is worthy to receive Power, and Wisdom, and Riches, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory and Blessing:* Now if by *Christ, the Lamb that was slain within, the Seed that suffers within, and desires to be freed from Sin,* &c. *G. W.* does not mean *Christ*, really and strictly speaking, but will have it to be *a misterious and elegant way of speaking*, the Property and Effect being put for the Cause, so that by the *Seed, Christ* in Men, according to his Explication, in *Judgment fixed*, just now given, he meaneth only the created Souls of Men, as begotten and born of the immortal Seed; then how will this agree with his making the created Soul as begotten and born of the immortal Seed, to be the *Lamb that was slain, who is worthy to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing?* Rev. 5. 12. which is a Doxology of divine Praise, and an Act of divine Worship given to that Lamb, by Angels and Saints; and seeing, according to *G. W.*'s Explication here given in his *Judgment fixed*, the Seed that is born in them, suffers in them, slain in them, is neither God nor Christ, and yet had divine Worship and Honour given thereto by Angels and Saints: It follows, that according to *G. W.* divine Adoration is due to regenerated Souls of Men, or at least, to something in the Souls of regenerated Men that is neither God nor Christ, but a *meer Creature*, which is abominable Idolatry, and yet justified here by *G. W.* in his *Judgment fixed*, compared with his *He-goats Horn*. I cannot understand how *G. W.* can cleat himself here, unless he should tell us of *another elegant way of speaking*; that is, to give to this *Allegorical* Christ Jesus born within them, the Lamb that was slain within them, an *allegorical* divine Adoration and Worship, and that it was only this allegorical divine Adoration that the Saints and Angels gave to this Lamb slain within Men, Rev. 5. 12. But how ponderical and idle any such Gloss would be, I need not shew, and yet I suppose it is the best he can find.

But again, that not only a *Seed of God* suffers in Men by their Sins, but that *God*, and Christ as *God*, suffers in Men by their Sins [in plain Contradiction to what he

has

has delivered in his *Judgment fixed*] is evident from his *Divinity of Christ*, p. 35. 58. where he hath these following Words [in Opposition to *T. Vincent*, who had affirmed, *That Christ, as God, did not suffer, but only as Man.*] *Whereas* (saith he) *T. V. had affirmed, That Christ, as God, could not suffer: As to his saying, That God cannot suffer, is in one Sense, not true, though he intended as to Death, yet the Spirit of God hath suffered, and hath been grieved by Man's Transgressions:* And for this he cites *Isa.* 63. 10. *Amos* 2. 13. *Hos.* 11. 8, 9. *Psal.* 95. *Gen.* 6. 6. *Psal.* 78. 40. *Isa.* 1. 7, 13. and *Isa.* 43. 24. 25.

Note, Here the State of the Controversie betwixt *G. W.* and *T. V.* was not about a metaphorical suffering of God, but a real, which is here affirmed by *G. W.* in Contradiction to what he has said in his *Judgment fixed*, as above quoted. And because *G. W.* in his *Judgment fixed*, p. 322. blames *Jeffery Bullock* for his dealing unfairly and fallaciously, with charging it on the Quakers for preaching and printing, That the Seed, Spirit, Word, or God, is both in Prison, Bondage, and Captivity, and to be quickned, raised, &c. without adding, *That the said J. B. hath not produced any Book of ours or our Friends, wherein this Doctrine is printed*: Surely *G. W.* had a very treacherous Memory, or writ this against his own Conscience, seeing he had writ so expresly himself in his former Books, as is above quoted out of his *He-goats Horn*, his *Brief Discovery*, and his *Divinity of Christ*, all which were in print before *J. B.* gave this Charge against them. And as to his Distinction betwixt God or Christ, and a Seed of God or Christ that is oppressed, and suffers in Men by their Sins, as if it were not either God or Christ that thus suffers in Men by their Sins; this is contradictory to *G. W.*'s own former Doctrine, who brought *Amos* 2. 13. to prove that God suffers in Men by their Sins (*viz.* not metaphorically, by that Figure commonly called *Anthropopathia*, but really, which was the only State of the Controversie.) *Behold, I am pressed under you, as a Cart that is full of Sheaves.* Now, seeing this must be understood literally and strictly, according to *G. W.* it must be a very great Suffering, that he thinks God suffers in Men by their Sins, that may be said to amount to an Oppression, which yet he denies is applicable to God, in his *Judgment fixed*. And seeing the Seed within, that is slain, he would have it, in his *He-goats Horn*, to be the Lamb that was slain, *Rev.* 5. 12. to whom the Angels gave divine Worship; he must needs own that Seed to be Christ, and that Christ to be God; and consequently, not only that God suffers in Men by their Sins, but is slain in them, or else confess Idolatry to be lawful. But that the Seed that is within Men, that *W. Penn* will have to be the promised Seed of the Woman that bruiseth the Head of the Serpent, is Christ, and God over all, blessed for ever more: Take his expres Words in his *Christian Quaker*, p. 97, 98. *The Seed of the Promise is an holy and spiritual Principle of Light, Life, and Power, that being received into the Heart, bruiseth the Serpent's Head; and because the Seed, which cannot be that Body* (viz. *that was outwardly born of the Virgin*) *is Christ, as testifie the Scriptures, the Seed is one, and that Seed Christ, and Christ, God over all, blest for ever.*

But when is it, that the Seed in Men is the *Mighty God?* Is it at its first being received into the Heart, according to *W. P.*'s Notions? Hear himself unriddle the Mistery, in his *Christian Quaker*, p. 98. *And though particular Persons might arrive at great Attainments, even to a beholding the Day of the Seeds compleat Redemption and Conquest over all its Oppressors.* [Mark this, *G. Whitehead*, That the Seed, which is Christ, and God over all, is for a time *oppressed, and suffers under its Oppressors*, which yet thou hast the Impudence to deny, that any of thy Friends use any such Phrase,]

(*when*

(*when what was but in Condition of a Seed or new-born Child, ſhould become the* only Son, *the wonderful Counſeller, the* Mighty God, *the everlaſting Father, and Prince of Peace, of the Encreaſe of whoſe Government, there ſhould be no End, as ſpeaks the Prophet* ;) *yet it is granted, through that good Underſtanding the Lord has given us in theſe weighty things, that the Generality were but weak, dark, and in Bondage, as ſaith the Apoſtle, under carnal and beggerly Elements, not clearly ſeeing through thoſe outward Services; which, if I may ſo ſpeak, God held them in Hand with, condeſcending to their Weakneſs, that he might both keep them from gadding after the pompous Invention, and idolatrous Worſhip of other Nations, and point out unto them, under their great Carnality, that more hidden Glory and ſpiritual Diſpenſation. which ſhould afterwards be revealed, to wit, the compleat Redemption of the Soul, and Reign of the Holy Seed, from the Child born, and the Son given, to the wonderful Counſeller, the mighty God, the everlaſting Father, and Prince of Peace ; of the Increaſe of whoſe Government there ſhould be no End.*

Note, Thus we ſee, he wholly applies that moſt excellent Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, 9. 6. concerning the holy Seed and Child Jeſus born of the Virgin, whoſe Name is, The Wonderful Counſeller, The Mighty God, &c. to a Seed or Principle within, which groweth up from a Seed to a Child, and from a Child, to become the Only Son, and ſo to become the Mighty God ; which exactly agreeth with that blaſphemous Notion of *W. Baily*, in the Collection of his Works, p. 292, 293. *Be thou but the Virgin, the Power of the moſt High ſhall overſhadow thee, and that holy thing, which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God; this was Chriſt's Name in the Womb* (read, *within*) *and then had other Names, as* Jeſus *and* Emanuel. *But the Virgin is ſubject to the Power of the Moſt High, where Chriſt is known to be firſt a Holy Thing, then a Child given, and a Son born, which is* Emanuel, *God with us, a Saviour, the wonderful Counſeller, the mighty God, the Prince of Peace.* Thus we ſee, according to theſe Men's Doctrine, God ſows a Seed in Men, the which Seed, as Men attend to, and obey it, they are the Virgin in whom this Seed comes to be a Child born, and that Child becomes the only Son, the wonderful Counſeller, the mighty God : And a Preacher in *Penſilvania*, of the Quakers, did illuſtrate this great Quaker Miſtery, to another Quaker in *Penſilvania*, who told it me after this manner, by this following Similitude ; *A Hen lays an Egg, ſits, and hatches, and brings forth a Chick, and that Chick becomes a Hen, equal to the Mother Hen* ; which I confeſs is a very plain and intelligible Explication of the blaſphemous Notion of *G. W. W. P.* and *W. B.* above mentioned : Thus God, in every regenerate Man, begets God, and the God begotten is equal, in Power and Might, to the God that did beget. The Quakers Name that gave this Similitude, is *Jacob Talner*, a Dutch-man, who began to ſpeak at the Beginning of the firſt Meeting at Turners-Hall, but ſaying nothing pertinent to the purpoſe, and confeſſing he had no Deputation from any of the Perſons properly concerned, was deſired by the Auditory, as well as by me, to be ſilent, that the Service of that Meeting might not be hindred. I proffered to give him a Meeting at that Place any other Day, if he had a mind to diſpute, but he did not agree to my Propoſition. This very Perſon is a frequent Preacher in the Quakers Meetings here in *London*.

Note, I find in *W P*'s *Chriſtian Quaker*, p. 100. that he acknowledgeth that *Chriſt is called Light, by a Metaphor* ; *And whereas*, he ſaith, *the Light in Men has been reſiſted, grieved, and as it were, ſlain : The Word*, Slain, *is alſo metaphorical, yet he contends, it ſuffers in Men, and hath been deeply wounded in wicked Men* ; *yea, he*

makes

makes the Sufferings of Christ's Godhead, to have been the greatest, p. 102. *He was his Manhood insensible of it*, he saith; and a little after he saith, *As outwardly he gave his outward Life for the World, so he might inwardly shed abroad in their Souls, the Blood of God, that is, the holy purifying Life and Virtue, which is in him, as the Word, God, and as which, he is the Life of the World.* Thus we see the mistick Notion of the Blood of God.

For a Close on this Head, I shall produce a large Quotation out of *Truth's Defence*, p. 48, 49, 50. giving a plain Contradiction to *G. W.* his denying the Word God, to be imprisoned, or in Bondage, *&c.* It having been queried by his Opponent, *Whether there be a Possibility to hide Christ, the Son of Righteousness, quite under a Cloud where he really is.* *G. F.* thus answers, *Thou Enemy of God, thou dost hide the Talent in thee, under the Clod of the Earth in thee: If thou hast an Ear, thou mayst hear, 1 Pet. 3. 19. The Ministers of God, they speak to the Spirits in Prison, and the Prisoners shall come out of Prison. The Son of Perdition is above all that is called God in thee, 2 Thess. 2. 2. Thou blind Hypocrite, was not he in Egypt while Herod was King, and out of Egypt have I called my Son, saith the Lord? Who hast thou preached all this while? Thou art one that keeps the Light in Prison in thee.* And in Answer to another Question, *Whether the Devil is stronger than Christ, the Flesh than the Spirit, or where dost thou find he was ever a Prisoner in Satan's Chains?* Ans. *We witness he was in Satan's Chains, and is in thee, else how could they crucifie him afresh?* This, with much more after the same Strain, is found in the Pages quoted, and which was read at the second Meeting.

Is not this a great Perversion, as well as nonsensical Exposition of *G. F.* on this Place of *Peter*, to prove that wicked Men imprison Christ in them? *The Spirits in Prison* (whereof *Peter* writes in that Place) *were sometimes disobedient in the Days of Noah*, as the following Words expressly declare: But how could Christ in them be disobedient; not only Spirits, but disobedient Spirits? This is that Apostle of the Quakers, of whom *W. P.* saith, in his Preface to *G. F.*'s Journal, *He had an extraordinary Gift in opening the Scripture, he would go to the Marrow of things*, saith *W. P.* Is not this a rare Instance of it?

Upon the reading these Places, *Samuel Jobson*, one of the Quakers Elders said, *George, doth not the Scriptures say, that some crucifie Christ afresh?* I answered, It is said in Scripture, they crucifie him to themselves, but it is not said, they crucifie him to himself, or in himself; by crucifying him there, is understood their rendring themselves guilty of his Death, and depriving themselves, by their unworthy Life and Practises, of the Salvation purchased by him. I asked him, did he believe, that wicked Men, by their Sins, do really wound Christ in them, and kill him, and let out his Blood in them, and that that Blood is the Blood of Atonement. He said, The Scripture saith, *If we walk in the Light*, &c. *the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all Sin.* I asked him, Whether that Blood was the Blood of Christ without us, that was shed on the Cross? He said, *The Blood was the Life.* But I asked again, Was it the Blood without us, or the Blood within us? He said, *It was spiritual Blood:* But being much pressed, not only by me, but some Ministers present, to answer, whether it was Blood without him, or Blood within him? He waved any direct Answer; and I shewing the Auditory, that the Notion of *G. F.* and other Teachers of the Quakers who had learned it of him was, *That the Blood, by which we are cleansed from Sin, is the Blood within*, which he calls, *The Blood of the Seed*; as is more fully afterwards to be proved; and this Seed is Christ, and is not a Creature.

Another Quaker said, *Is not the Seed Christ, and is not Christ within, the Seed of the Woman that bruiseth the Head of the Serpent?* [At this, some of the Hearers said, Here is Proof enough of their Error, *The Seed of the Woman, is the Seed within them.*] I answered, Christ is called the Seed of the Woman, and the Seed of *Abraham*, as he came in the Flesh without us, and was made of a Woman, and was the Son of *Abraham:* And though I own Christ within, by his Godhead Presence, and by his common Illumination in all Men, and by his special Presence, and special Illuminations in the faithful; yet I deny, that the Seed of God in Men, is either Christ or God; I own that there is a Seed of God in the faithful, but I deny G. F. his Notion of it, *That it is not a Creature.* I asked *Daniel Philips*, what he said to my former Question; Did Men, by their Sins, really wound God in them, as some of their Teachers have affirmed? After some Demur, he said he would not give a positive Answer; but take it into further Consideration, whereupon some of the Auditory did commend him; I said, it was better so to do, than to assert such a vile Error; however, by this it appeared how uncertain they were, and how little agreed about some of their chief Principles.

Having thus given an Account of G. W's wild Notions, concerning Christ the Seed within, that the Power takes hold of and raises up: I will proceed to shew the like by some new Quotations out of *G. F.* referring to other Quotations given in my third Narrative, especially on the same Subject. See my third Narrative, p. 25.

G. F. in his *G. M.* p. 324. quotes his Opponent saying, *That the Seed to whom the Promise of Salvation is made, is or hath been Sinners.* Ans. *The Promise of God is to the Seed which hath been laden, as a Cart with Sheaves by the Sinner, which Seed is the Hope Christ that purifies, even as God is pure; and here is the Creature come to know its Liberty, among the Sons of God, and the Seed Christ never sinned, in the Male nor in the Female, in the Jew nor in the Gentiles: And of this Mystery was the great High Professors ignorant of, that stood at a Distance from the Gentiles, that Christ had no room among them, though they talked of him, but in the Stable, in the Manger, and in their Mouths to talk of him with their Lips, and such Christ calls Graves and Sepulchres, and whited Walls, and the Wall is not the Seed, but the Seed is Christ, and not the Sepulchre nor the Grave; so this Promise is not unto Seeds as many, but to one, the Seed which is Christ.* Note these gross Perversions of Scripture.

Again, P. 171. *G. M. Now they feel not the Comfort, nor the Benefit, but by the Faith of Christ Jesus, the one Offering in which God is pleased with all, which is acceptable, which is Christ's Offering, his Sacrifice, his Flesh, his Blood, his Life, his Word must be manifest and received within, before they come to Justification, Sanctification, and Redemption.*

P. 173. *And where Jesus Christ is within, the Word is there, and God is there, and this is the great Mistery of Godliness.*

Again, *G. M.* p. 158. *Of this Body (which is that by which Christ reconciles unto God) are all the Professors, Protestants and Papists, ignorant of this Seed that breaks the Enmity.*

P. 159. *And by Faith is every one justified in the Blood of the Seed, the Flesh of Christ, the Lord from Heaven shed for the Sins of the whole World. The Blood of the Seed which is the Life that cleanseth; and* this Blood is felt within, *for it purgeth the Conscience from dead Works, to serve the living God; and here is the great Mistery of God, and the Wisdom of God.*

Note,

Note, This Flesh and Blood that he saith is the great Mistery, which neither Papists nor Protestants know, is that Flesh which was crucified in *Adam*, when *Adam* sinned, and the Blood that was then shed, in which is the Belief that takes away the Sin, as I have shewed in a large Quotation out of another Book of his in my third Narrative, p. 25.

For a Close upon this Head, I shall quote a Passage of G. F. in that called *Several Papers given forth*, &c. by G. F. who is there called *Minister of the eternal Word of God*. p. 47. *Now to all dear ones and dear Hearts, I speak, the same Seed which is Christ, the same Spirit takes upon it now as then; yea, the same Temptations, the same Devil, and the same Worship of the World is winding into another Form and Colour; but Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. And the same Seed passing into the Wilderness, and there is tempted to lust after the Creature; you that are in the Wilderness, witness this with me, and the same Temptations doth to Despair, and make themselves away.*

Note, here all along, from the Passages above quoted out of G. F. and G. W. and many more which might be quoted out of them and others, it evidently appears, that the greatest things that are written of Christ, either by Prophecy in the Old Testament, or fulfilled in the New Testament; his outward Birth, his Incarnation, his taking hold, not of Angels, but the Seed of *Abraham*, his Sacrifice and Offering, his Blood, Death, Burial, Resurrection, Ascension; yea, his being tempted by Satan in the World; is all applied to the Seed Christ within, as the great Mistery of Godliness, yea, as greater than God manifest in Flesh without, as is quoted out of W. *Penn*, and as concerning Christ's Flesh without, that's a Figure, but Christ within is the Substance. Now to apply all this in way of Allegory to Christ incarnate within, the Seed that the Spirit takes hold of, to use G. F's Words, that looks like an Incarnation of the Holy Ghost in G. F. and his Brethren, is too rash, and goeth beyond the Bounds of Sobriety. But to turn it all to the greatest Reality, and all that's said of Christ without, to be the Allegory and Figure of the Substance within, as is effectually proved, is a plain overthrowing the Christian Faith.

But it's very hard to conceive how this Seed Christ within, as G. F. holds it forth, was or could be tempted of the Devil, to lust after the Creature; seeing, as he will have it, it is no Creature in itself, can it be supposed that the Devil would or could tempt the Godhead to lust after the Creature; and what this Seed can be, which G. F. calls Christ that's buried in the wicked, and elsewhere, the Spirit and Spirits in Prison, yea, the Prisoners in Hell, that the Quakers have preached to, that's no Creature, nor God, nor any Part of the divine Essence, for that cannot be divided into Parts, is unaccountable?

There yet remains three or four Passages which were objected in a printed Sheet, called *An Account from Colchester*, against G. W. and G. B. to which these seven Quakers in *Colchester* have given their Reply by way of Vindication, but all grosly fallacious, in that they call, *Some Account from Colchester*, as we shall see in what follows.

It was objected against G. W. out of his *Truth defending the Quakers*, page 65. Christopher Wade *affirmeth, That our blessed Saviour doth instruct Men to lay fast hold of, and to abide in such a Faith which confideth in himself, being without Men.* To this G. W. answereth, *That's contrary to the Apostles Doctrine, who preached the Word of Faith that was in their Hearts, and the Saints Faith stood in the Power of God, which was in them.*

Their Defence is, *That* George Whitehead's *words in his Answer, was not against* C. Wade's *excluding Christ's spiritual appearance and Lord Work of Righteousness in the Saints, by affirming, That our blessed Saviour doth totally condemn all such Faith, which doth trust, that Men are righteous in their own Bodies by what Spirit soever, either from Heaven or elsewhere, that Righteousness is wrought in Mens Bodies*; p. ibid. *Whereby he opposed Christ's Work of Regeneration in true Believers, as also his affirming that the true Christ doth prove himself not to be a Spirit.*

To this I say, suppose C. *Wade* had erred on the one hand, this doth not justifie this most scandalous Assertion of *George Whitehead*. That it is contrary to *Rom.* 10. to confide in Christ without Men, whereas *Rom.* 10. 8, 9, 10. teacheth us, That to to believe in Christ without us, and so to confess him, is necessary to our Salvation. It's observable how both they and G. W. himself waves giving a plain and positive Answer to this great Objection. They say indeed, in page 21. 'As there is one 'Lord Jesus Christ, and one true Faith in him, this Faith respects Christ, both as 'without us in the Heavens, and as he is in the Hearts of his Saints.' But they do not tell what they mean by Christ as without us in the Heavens; not one Word of their Faith in Christ, as he is both God and Man, and who as Man, consisting of a created Soul and Body, the same in Nature with the Nature of other Men (but without Sin) is in the Heavens in our glorified Nature: This being the thing that is mainly objected on this Head, and which they will not, nor dare not give a plain Answer unto, nor G. W. either, for it will detect him and their gross Error: or if they or he give a sound Answer, it will prove they are changed, and that will reflect on G. W's Infallibility.

But they grosly abuse C. *Wade* for his sound Doctrine, which G. W. has not fairly nor duely represented; for C. *Wade*, in that very Page, doth clear himself, both against a lying Charge, first, in G. *F.* who charged him, That he did totally exclude Works without any Distinction, G. M. p. 398. And the like false Charge doth G. W. load him with, That he opposed Christ's Work of Regeneration in true Believers, which is an extremely false Charge against him, as he sheweth at length; but he did only exclude them from being the meritorious Cause of our Justification, and the Foundation of our Faith; so that though Sanctification and good Works are necessary, and none can be either justified or saved without them, yet we must not trust in them, nor make a Saviour of them. But it's no Wonder that G. W. blames this Doctrine, who in his *Voice of Wisdom*, pleads for the Meritoriousness of good Works in Men, as grosly as the grossest Papists, yea, and much more grosly, as we may see in its proper Place. But this is G. *W.* and his Brethrens common Work, to misrepresent their Opponents, to hide their own vile Heresies. And as for C. *Wade's* saying, *Christ proved himself not to be a Spirit*, to wit, a meer *Spirit*, as he explains himself; he quoted for it, Christ's own Words, *Handle me and see me, for a Spirit has not Flesh and Bones as ye see me have*; and was not that a sufficient Proof that the Man Christ was not a meer Spirit.

Proofs

Proofs on the sixth Head, Concerning the Soul.

Whether the Soul of Man is a Part of God.

Whitehead is at great Pains, in his *Truth and Innocency*, page 7. and 9. to prove, that when *George Fox* said, *The Soul was a Part of God, and of God's Being*; *he did not mean the rational Soul of Man, and which he calls the reasonable Soul or Spirit formed in Man, but that divine Inspiration or Breath of Life, whereby Man became a living Soul, as the great and universal Soul of Mankind, even the Soul, or Life of the Soul, as some phrase it.*

And *Joseph Wyeth*, in his *Switch*, page 53. pleads, That he meant not *That the created Soul was a Part of God*; and will have it, that *George Fox* held, *That the Soul of Man was created.* But none of them give the least effectual Proof out of his Books, where *George Fox* mentions any created Soul to be in Man, that is not a Part of God: Their Inferences are weak, as *That Christ is the Bishop of the Soul*: *The Soul is in Transgression in Death*: *The Soul redeemed rejoyceth in God*: All this doth not proves that *George Fox* did hold, that the Soul of Man, in all these Considerations, was not a Part of God: For, according to him, the Soul being a Part of God, this part rejoyceth in God the Fulness; and God or Christ considered as the Fulness, is the Bishop of the Soul that is a Part of him, the Soul being like a Drop of Water returning into the Ocean, so taught the Ranters; and that all Creatures were Parts of God, who was the Substance of all things; and so saith *George Fox* expressly, *Great Mistery*, page 99. and *Edward Burrough*, see the Collection of his Works, pag. 827, 828. And *George Fox* denieth, That *either Christ or Men have a Humane Soul, or that Christ hath either a Humane Soul or Body*, Great Mistery, pag. 99, 100. His Objection is idle against *Humane*, as signifying Earthly, from *Humus*, the Ground, which is but a Cloak to cover his gross Error.

None of his Opponents said, the Soul was from the Earth: He might as much object against the Language of Scripture, that calleth Christ *the second Adam*, the Word *Adam* signifying *Red Earth*. That the Soul is in Transgression in Death, proves not that *George Fox* did not hold it to be a Part of God, for he and other Teachers among the Quakers teach, That what they call the Seed Christ, is crucified in the wicked, and is held in Satan's Chains, and what are these Chains but Sins, as is above proved out of *Truth's Def.* p. 49.

But for a full and clear Evidence, that *George Fox* did hold the Soul of Man to be a Part of God, in answer to *Magnus Byne* his Book, called, *The scornful Quakers answered*, Great Mistery, p. 90. *Is not the Soul without Beginning coming from God, returning into God again, who hath it in his Hand?* And in Answer to *Jonathan Clapham* his Book, called *A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine*, Great Mistery, page 100. *Is not this that cometh out from God, which is in God's Hand, part of God, of God and from God, and to God again, which Soul Christ is the Bishop of?*

It is to be noted and well observed, that this Opposition that *George Fox* made to those Men and his other Opponents, as *Richard Baxter*, and the five Ministers of *New Castle*, about the Soul which they denied to be a Part of God, or without Beginning, and he affirmed it was. [By Opposition to them] was not about any divine

vine Soul in the Soul that was the Life or Soul of it, as *George Whitehead* would have it; by which he means, God or the Holy Ghost, for in all Disputes, the Subject of the Dispute is one betwixt the Opponent and the Respondent; and though sometimes, where the Matter is intricate and nice, the Subject is hard to find out, and the Opponent may mean one thing, and the Respondent another; yet in a Case that is clear, and easie to be understood, as this Case is, there can be no Difficulty about the Subject of the Dispute, as indeed here there is none; which Subject of Dispute betwixt *George Fox* and his Opponents above mentioned, was purely and simply the Soul of Man, and not any divine Principle in the Soul. As to instance from *Magnus Byne*, the Beginning of this Controversie betwixt *Magnus Byne* and *George Fox*, about the Soul, was by a Question that *Magnus Byne* put to *Thomas Lawson* a Quaker, which was this [see in *Magnus Byne*, The scornful Quaker answered, page 103.] *What is the Soul of Man, and the Preciousness of it, seeing Christ says, It is more worth than all the World?*

To this *Thomas Lawson* the Quaker answers, 'The Ministers of Jesus, who come 'by the Will of God, such know the Soul, and watch for the Soul, *Heb.* 13. 17. 'But thy watching is for the Fleece, and art querying what the Soul is which lies in 'Death, and State, and Condemnation so long as it lives, and the false Accuser 'lives, and it the First-born knows not, nor the Preciousness of it, who prefers the 'World, and obeys it before the Light of Christ, and so sells the Soul for the World, 'as thou dost who professest him in thy Lip-talk, but denies him in Practice, Ways, 'and Conversation, though Christ saith, The Soul is more worth than all the 'World.

To which, *Magnus Byne*, his Opponent thus replieth; 'In all this Answer, there 'is not a Tittle unto the Question; here it appears thy perfect knowledge fails thee. 'Here thou guessest, that the Soul is Christ, for he is the First-born the Scripture 'mentions; and so according to thy Blasphemy, Christ it seems may be damned and 'cast into Hell, for so it is said of the Soul, Fear him who is able to cast Body and 'Soul into Hell. See how dark thou art in making no Difference between the Soul 'and Christ; the Soul is indeed a precious thing, there is a kind of Infiniteness in it, 'which all the World cannot satisfie; and therefore the Man was a Fool that said, 'Soul, take thine Ease because thy Barns are full; and yet notwithstanding this kind 'of Infiniteness in the Soul as being restless, till it return to God; yet it cannot be 'Infiniteness it self, it cannot be the First-born, for of whole Man it is said, whereof 'the Soul is the more noble Part, *What is Man that thou art mindful of him?* Heb. '2. 6, 7. Man you see is inferior unto the Angels, much more inferior to the Son of 'God. And farther (saith he) though the Soul be the Seat of Christ, and Christ be 'hid there as a Treasure in a Field, even in the innermost Room of the Soul, yet 'the Soul cannot comprehend the infinite Majesty; so Christ in his divine Essence or 'Being, much less, can it be Christ who is God over all blessed for evermore?' And 'though there be indeed a blessed Union and Fellowship between Christ and an holy 'Soul, yet still there is a vast Difference between the Essence or being of the Soul 'and Christ, the one being still a Creature, and the other the Creator of 'it.

Next he comes to give his own Definition of it; 'The Soul (saith *Magnus Byne*) 'is a most noble Power, a living Being, an Essence that quickens the Body, and 'yet dies not, sleeps not when the Body dies and sleeps, but returns unto God who 'gave it: This Soul is a little Map of the great World, and makes Man a little

World;

'World; for in his Soul is comprehended the Life of Plants, the Senſe 'of Beaſts, the Reaſon of Men and Angels: This Soul quickens and 'makes Man a living Creature, a ſenſitive Creature, a rational Creature. After 'he has deſcribed the Soul of Man (which he expreſly calls a Creature, as above 'quoted) in its ſeveral Powers and Faculties of the Mind, Reaſon, Judgment, 'Will, Memory, Fancy, Appetite and Affections; to wit, the created Soul of 'Man: He ſaith, God is the Life of our Life, and Soul of our Soul; he proceeds 'very regularly to tell, That in this Soul of Man, or in the Spirit or Mind of it, as 'the higheſt Power, when it is regenerated and reſigned, lives the great King ma-'nifeſted; here he dwells as in *Mount Sion*, here he delights to be as in his Temple. 'And in this Soul of Man, unenlightened and unrenewed, Chriſt lies hid and is as 'one dead [note, he doth not ſay dead, as the Quakers ſay, but is as one dead] 'and unſavory unto the Soul, and ſo the Soul is in Darkneſs, Weakneſs, Sinfulneſs, 'Sorrow, Fear, Bondage.

Thus we ſee *Magnus Byne* doth ſo clearly ſtate the *Subject* of the Controverſie betwixt him and the Quakers his Opponents, which was the *Soul of Man*, the *created reaſonable Soul*, that is neither God nor Chriſt, though he owneth that God and Chriſt are in the Souls of Men, both regenerate and unregenerate, but after different Manners, that he leaves no room for any of the leaſt Capacity of Underſtanding to miſtake the true Subject of the Controverſie; and therefore *George Fox*, whom *Joſeph Wyeth* magnifieth as the APOSTLE in this Age, could not be ſuch a Sot as not to underſtand the true Subject of the Diſpute, which was the *Soul of Man*, the *reaſonable* Soul, that which *thinks*, *wills*, *loves*, *which dieth not when the Body dieth*, and which again and again he calleth a Creature, and the created Soul, diſtinguiſheth it from Chriſt in the Soul, which he ſaith, is the Life of our Life, and Soul of our Soul. [The ſame Expreſſion uſed by *George Whitehead*, in his *Truth and Innocency*.] Yet notwithſtanding all this clear ſtating the Subject of the Diſpute, which was the Soul of Man [and not that divine Principle in the Soul.] *George Fox* doth make a great Difference with him, and ſets himſelf in great Oppoſition to him, and will needs have it, That the Soul [to wit, the Soul of Man, which was the only Subject of the Diſpute] is without Beginning, coming from God, returning to God again. Alſo he oppoſeth *Magnus Byne*'s Saying, There is a kind of Infiniteneſs in the Soul [*viz.* with Reſpect to the Largeneſs of its Deſires, which the whole World cannot ſatisfie, as he explained himſelf;] but it is not Infiniteneſs it ſelf, which *George Fox* wrongly quotes by adding the Word IN, making him ſay, It is not Infiniteneſs IN it ſelf, which mars the Senſe: But *George Fox*, in Oppoſition to *M. B.* will have the Soul of Man [which was the Subject of the Diſpute] to be Infiniteneſs it ſelf without Beginning.

Note, Here a Quaker. *Daniel Philips* objected, That Diſputants might differ about the Subject of the Diſpute, ſo as the Opponent might mean one thing, and the Reſpondent another: But I anſwered, They might ſo, when the Matter is intricate and obſcure by Ambiguities of Words; but it could not be ſo here, the Subject of the Diſpute being ſo clearly propoſed, that none but a Sot or Cheat could or would miſtake the Subject, which the Quakers will not allow *G. F.* to be, having ſo great an Eſteem of his Wiſdom, as the Apoſtle in this Age.

And-

And the like is to be said of all the Disputes betwixt *George Fox* and his other Opponents about the Soul, which were only about the Soul of Man, and not at all about God or Christ in the Soul, for they all did contend there was a real Distinction betwixt the Soul and God or Christ who was in it: But *George Fox* would allow none, but still contended, That the Soul, concerning which they and he disputed, was a Part of God without Beginning, *&c.* And in his Great Mistery, page 91. he blames *Magnus Byne* for calling the Soul a Creature, and saith, he is in *Babylon* and Confusion. And in his Dispute with the five Ministers of *New Castle*, Great Mistery, pag. 227, 228. he saith, *The Soul, whereof Christ is the Bishop, is divine and immortal*; also he most grosly wrongs the five Ministers of *New Castle*, and charges them with holding it to be their own Principles; Great Mistery, page 227. *That the Soul is a Part of the divine Essence.*

And in his Great Mistery, page 29. he saith to them, *And so you five have judged your selves to be Blasphemers, who said, The Soul was Part of the divine Essence, and yet it is Blasphemy to say so.* This he most unjustly chargeth in them, quoting their Book, called, *A Discovery of that Generation of Men called Quakers*; but in that very Book, which was produced and the Words quoted, as they are in that Book, page 5. the five Ministers deliver it, not as any Position of theirs, but as one of the Quakers Positions [having this Title on the Top, *Quakers Positions*] being the third in Number, and in all being seventeen] *That the Soul is a Part of the divine Essence.* What Excuse can *George Whitehead*, or any of his Brethren find for this palpable Injustice in *George Fox*? Could he be so sottish as not to distinguish betwixt the five Ministers Positions, and what they call the *Quakers Positions*, and which they expresly blame and disown, and give their Arguments against? And if he was not so ignorantly sottish in the Case, what can it be construed but a wilful Lie thus for him to charge them?

And for a further Confirmation that *George Fox* did hold, That that very Soul of Man [which *George Whitehead* calls the reasonable and rational Soul, *Truth and Innocency*, pag. 7, 8, 9. and which *George Whitehead* confesseth hath sinned] doth not sin, and is not at any time a sinful Soul; consequently is, according to him, a Part of God; I bring a Quotation out of his Great Mistery, page 337. *George Fox* quotes his Opponent saying, *The Soul of Man is a reasonable sinful Substance*: To this *George Fox* answers, *How can that which is sinful be reasonable? And if that which is unsinful be reasonable, and sinful be reasonable both, then they are one in Unity.* The Lord will take the Soul for an Offering for Sin, *Isa.* 5. 3. *See how thou and the Prophet agrees here. But what is that Soul that the wicked is not able to kill? Is it not that which God hath in his Hand? And this is a Lye to say, That which is reasonable is sinful.*

Note how grosly he perverts that Place in *Isa.* 53. 10. *When thou shall make his Soul an Offering for Sin*: This is understood of the Soul of the Man Christ who suffered without us, and not of any Soul within us, which yet is *George Fox*'s Notion; and this very Soul in Men, this reasonable Soul, *George Fox* will have it to be the Offering for Sin; And because it is so, therefore he concludes it is not sinful, not capable of sinning; yet *George Whitehead* saith, *The reasonable Soul is capable of sinning, and hath sinned in Men (though it never sinned*

ſinned in Chriſt.) See how theſe two Apoſtles do now contradict one another, and yet none of them fallible! Note, again, how *George Fox* thought he put a very puzzling Query to his Opponent to convince him, that the reaſonable Soul in Men did not ſin; *What is that Soul that the wicked cannot kill?* Surely by this Query *George Fox* meant the Soul that the wicked cannot kill, was not the Soul that could ſin, wherein he ſheweth his great Ignorance; for though the wicked cannot kill the ſinful Souls of Men, yet as Chriſt ſaid in the following Words, *He is to be feared*, to wit, God, *that can caſt both Soul and Body into Hell Fire*: Now what Soul can be caſt into Hell Fire, but the Soul that ſinneth? But laſtly, By *George Fox*'s Argument, That *if the ſinful Soul be reaſonable, and the unſinful Soul be reaſonable alſo*, then they are one in Unity, which he would have to be a great Abſurdity; thus he hath plainly diſcloſed the Miſtery of his profound Doctrine, that is a Branch of Ranteriſm, *viz.* that there are but two Principles, one good in Man, that never ſinneth or doth evil, the other bad, that ſinneth, and never doeth good; the one is God, or a Part of God, the other the Devil, or a Part of the Devil: And his denying that one and the ſame Soul doth ſin at one Time, and doth well at another Time, clearly proveth, that according to him, there is not any Soul of Man, but what is either a Part of God, or of the Devil: And he diſcovereth his great Ignorance, in denying that the reaſonable Soul is ſinful, the contrary whereof is true, that no Soul but a reaſonable Soul, is or can be ſinful: for what is it that makes the Beaſts uncapable of ſinning, but that they are not reaſonable?

And whereas his Opponent had very well argued, that *the evil Spirits are both ſinful and reaſonable*; *George Fox* anſwereth, *This is a Lie, for reaſonable is not ſinful, unreaſonable is ſinful*; quoting 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 2. *And that we may be delivered from unreaſonable and wicked Men*, for all Men have not Faith. But this doth nothing favour his Manichean Notion; he was ſo ignorant as not to diſtinguiſh betwixt the Faculty of Reaſon, and the Act of Reaſon, when Men that are reaſonable, and have reaſonable Souls, act contrary to Reaſon; they are ſaid to be unreaſonable, to wit, in Act; but ſtill, the Soul that ſinneth is reaſonable, with reſpect to the rational Faculty, nor could evil Spirits ſin, if they were not reaſonable, *i. e.* indued with rational Faculties? Beſides, the Greek Word, in 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 2. is not ἀλόγων, but ἀτόπων, and is not ſo properly tranſlated Unreaſonable, but (as it is on the Margin) Abſurd, *i. e.* ſuch, who, though they have Reaſon, yet will not give place to Reaſon, but act contrary to it; and *George Fox*, had he had the right Uſe of his Reaſon, might have ſeen, that it is no more an Argument againſt the Soul of Man being reaſonable, that it acts unreaſonably, than it is an Argument that the Soul is not enlightened by the Light within, becauſe it often acts contrary to the Dictates of it.

Again, for a further Confirmation of *George Fox*'s Doctrine, That the Soul that ſinneth, is not the Soul that is to be ſaved; and that therefore, the Soul that is ſaved, or is to be ſaved, is only Chriſt, the Seed within Men: Hear what *George Fox* ſaith, Great Miſtery, page 324. he quotes his Opponent ſaying, *That the Seed, to whom the Promiſe of Salvation is made, is or hath been Sinners.* This he oppoſeth ſaying, *The Promiſe of God is to the Seed, which hath been laden as a Cart with Shaves by the Sinner, which Seed is the Hope Chriſt, that purifies even as*

God is pure: So this Promiſe is not to Seeds, as many, but to one, the Seed which is Chriſt.

Note, In the ſame Paragraph he ſaith, *So here is the Creature come to know its Liberty amongſt the Sons of God, and the Seed Chriſt, never ſinned in the Male nor in the Female.*

Note what he means by the Creature that comes to know its Liberty, which hath not ſinned, and hath the Promiſe of Salvation, ſeems not intelligible, for he denieth that the Seed is a Creature, and yet it is that to which the Promiſe of Salvation is, to wit, the Seed Chriſt in the Male and in the Female that never ſinned; but he groſly perverts that Place in *Gal.* 3. 16. for by the Seed Chriſt, is there meant Chriſt as he came outwardly according to the Fleſh out of *Abraham*'s Loins, to whom the Promiſe was, that in him all Nations of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed, but this was not to a Seed within that needed Salvation.

Like to this is what he ſaith in Great Miſtery, p. 15. having quoted his Opponent ſaying, *There is nothing in Man to be ſpoken to but Man:* To this he thus oppoſeth, *How then Miniſtred the Apoſtle to the Spirit, and Chriſt ſpake to the Spirits in Priſon, and* Timothy *was to ſtir up the Gift that was in him, and the Spirit of the Father ſpeaks within them, and the Light it ſhines in the Heart? Here the Scriptures are for Correction of thee, and Reproof of thee, who ſaid, there is nothing to ſpeak to in Man but Man.*

Again, In Great Myſtery, p. 187. he quotes his Opponent ſaying, *It would be good News, if the Quakers ſhould go and preach to the Spirits in Hell.* To this he anſwers, *The Quakers have been among the Priſoners that be in Hell, and miniſtred to that, and the* CORRUPTIONS *ſhall go into the Fire that hath no End, and they that do wickedly and forget God, ſhall go into Hell, and Death and Hell ſhall go into the Lake of Fire; and there is more in theſe Words yet than thou canſt receive, for God is the Salvation of all Men, but ſpecially them that believe.*

Note, thus we ſee he is very charitable, and the Quakers Miniſters are very charitable, that they have been among the Priſoners in Hell, and preached to that. But how is this great Charity conſiſtent with his ſaying, That that which ſinneth is not ſaved, unleſs he mean that Sin is not ſaved, though the Creature is?

The very ſame Doctrine, concerning the Soul, I find aſſerted by *Edward Burrough* in his Works, Coll. page 27. *Thou ſayeſt, one of us told thee,* That that which ſinned could not be ſaved. I anſwer (ſaith *Edward Burrough*) *It is out of the Reach of thy Wiſdom, and thy vulturous Eye ſhall never ſee it, I ſay, as the Scripture ſaith, The Soul that ſinneth muſt die, and every Man muſt die for his own Iniquity: If thou haſt an Ear, thou mayſt hear.*

Thus we ſee the Agreement of theſe two great Teachers of the Quakers, about the Souls that ſin, that they ſhall not be ſaved, nor can be ſaved. But how groſly doth *Edward Burrough* pervert thoſe Scriptures to prove his moſt corrupt Doctrine, that is plain Ranteriſm? Becaule the Scripture ſaith, *The Soul that ſinneth muſt die*; doth it therefore follow, That it cannot afterwards be ſaved, both from Death, and Sin, that is the Cauſe of it? Indeed Sin hath brought a Spiritual Death upon the Souls of Men: But what then? Muſt they therefore none of them that have ſinned be ſaved? Had

not

not the Ephesians been great Sinners, yea, and they were dead in their Sins and Trespasses, yet these very same Men having the same Souls, were quickened and made alive by Christ, *Ephes.* 2. 3. *And you hath he quickened who were dead in Trespasses and Sins?*

And *George Whitehead* himself is guilty of the same absurd Doctrine with G. F. and *Edward Burrough*, who in his *He-goats Horn*, pag. 11, 12. denieth that Christ hath our Nature in Heaven, and that it is one and the same Nature in Men, by which the Gentiles sinned, and by which they did the things contained in the Law: And in his *Voice of Wisdom*, page 20. he holdeth, That *Christ is both the Efficient and Subject of the good Works that are wrought in Men*, which is in effect to say, it is not Men, or the Souls of Men that repent, believe, obey God, but Christ in them, or else he must say, The Soul that believes, repents, obeys, is Christ; and though in his later Books he seems to deny this, yet will retract nothing, for that would reflect on his Infallibility: But his common Salve for this Sore is, That he may see cause otherwise to word the Matter, and yet mean the same thing, as he has of late expresst in some of his Books.

Note, Whereas in the Close of the third Meeting, a Letter of *John Audland* (a Preacher among the Quakers) to *George Fox*, was read, wherein is contained grosse Idolatry, which confirms, in matter of Fact, what *George Fox* said of himself, *That he was equal to God*, and *that he was Christ*; and upon this Notion *John Audland* addressed himself to *George Fox*, as to God and Christ, in his said Letter, the which, for its Affinity with the Doctrine of *George Fox*, discovered in the first and second Part of this Narrative, I think fit here to insert.

John Audland's Blasphemous Letter to *George Fox*, Spelt and Pointed according to the Original.

DEare and presious one in whome my life is beynd up and my strenth in thee stands, by thy breathings I am nurisht and refresht: and by thee my strenth is renewed: blesst art thow for Ever more: and blesst are all they that Enjoy thee: life and strenth comes from thee holy one: and thow art the blesst of the lord for Ever more, dear dear reach unto mee, that I may be strenthened, to stand in the mighty power and dread of the lord, for the sarvisse is very great, my travell and burthen was never, soe as now since I saw thee: but dayly doe I find thy Presence with me, which doth exceedingly Preserve mee; for I cannot reane but in thy presence and power: pray for me that I may stand in thy dread for Ever more: deare my deare brother John Cam *hath been Exceeding sicke and he is very weake I can say little of his Recovery as yet his wife is with him she is deare and preciously keept; their deare love is to thee, chreach through all in thy mighty power to him this bearer can declare to thee of the work this way:* Jo: Willkinson *and* Jo: Storey *is heare, their love is dearly to thee: deare harte there is one thinge that lies upon mee: I shall lay it before thee: as tuching my coming into* Wiltshire: *I was there at Justice* Stoks *house: and his famaley is all prety loveing and convinced: and he is a sober wise man and there is honesty in him which will stand: and there is a pretey people that way: it hath laid exceedingly upon me these* 3 *days of thy beeing at that place: I know not such another place in*

all

all the Countrey: for thee: dear: I was much wounded to know that thow was in such a rude place and suffers soe amongst them: and this was I moved to lay before thee: and great is my disere that it may be soe: the Place is about 20 *miles from* bretol *in* wiltshire *one mile from* chipenam *a markete towne Justice:* stoks *house,* Jo: Cam *tould me that the Justice he was with was a very Loving and prety man: this bearer was there he can declare to thee more: but oh that thou weare but at that place I mention: it is free and suteable for frends coming to thee: it lies much upon mee: and if thow find movings strike over thither I shall say no more of it: the worke is great heare away pray for us all that in thy Power we may abide for Evermore: I am thyne begoten and nurished by thee and in thy Power am I preserved glory unto thee holy one for Ever:*

John Audland.

The Letter being read, the Auditory was struck with Admiration, and generally signified their great Abhorrency of the Blasphemy and Idolatry contained in it to *G. Fox*: I told them, the Quakers had two Excuses as to this Letter, one was, that it was feigned; because, as it was once printed, it had a wrong Date, *viz.* 1665. which was some Years after *John Audland* was dead. But that was the Fault or Mistake of the Publisher of that Letter; that proves not the Letter to be feigned, for the original Manuscript was read in the Meeting, that had no date, and was handed about to several Ministers and others, together with another Letter of the same *John Audland*, in Manuscript, to another Person, who did unanimously judge it was the same hand that writ both the Letters. Their next Excuse is, That these Words in *John Audland*'s Letter, were not intended to *G. Fox*, but to Christ, or the Life in *G. Fox*: And the like Excuse *G. F.* made in a Letter writ with his own Hand [which was produced and read in the Meeting, and is ready to be produced before any that shall call for it] for a Woman Quaker, that in a Quakers Meeting, said to *George Fox*, *Thou art the King of* Israel: That she spoke her Words to Christ, *viz.* in *G. Fox*: But I told, This did not hinder it to be Idolatry, nor was any just Excuse in the Case, for it was the same Excuse that the Heathens gave for their worshiping Idols, because it was not the Idol, but the divine Power that was in it, which they worshiped. The like Excuse gave those Quakers that sung *Hosanna* to *James Nailer*, at his Procession into *Bristol*, and the same Excuse he made for them.

Part

PART III.

Containing the Proofs on the 7th Head, concerning Justification, and on the other following Heads, contained in the Printed Advertisement, Read at Turner's-Hall *the* 23d *of* January, 1699.

Concerning Justification by the Blood, Merits, and Righteousness of Christ.

I Produced a Printed Paper in the Meeting, call'd, *A few Positions of the sincere Belief and Christian Doctrine of the People call'd Quakers*, Sign'd by *G. Whitehead*; to which is adjoined another printed Paper, Sign'd by Thirty two Quakers, which, they say, was given to the Members of Parliament in the Year 1693: In which Paper, I noted divers gross Fallacies, and gross Equivocations; such as follow.

In the 4th Article of that Paper sign'd by *G. W.* I quoted these words. *The Divinity and Humanity*, i. e. *Manhood, of Christ Jesus, that as he is true God, and he is most glorious Man, our Mediator and Advocate, we livingly believe, and have often sincerely confessed in our Publick Testimonies and Writings.* On this I noted, That whatever seeming Confessions they have given in their publick Testimonies to this and other Doctrines, yet seeing they have contradicted them most evidently in their printed Books, and will not allow that they are chang'd in any one of their Principles, they do Fallaciously, and put a Cheat upon the Members of Parliament, and the whole Nation. A Quaker reply'd, Dost thou think that the *Members of Parliament* are not more Wise than to suffer themselves to be cheated by the Quakers? I answer'd, It is one thing for the Quakers to put a Cheat upon them; it is another thing for them to be cheated by them; a Cheat may be put on Men, and yet they not receive it. I hope they are so wise, as not to be deceived by them. Some of the Quakers objecting, That this tended to *Persecution*, so to represent them; I answered, it tended to no Persecution, being to rescue such from those Errors, who were corrupted by them, and prevent their further spreading; and would they take my advice, I would shew them a way to secure the Toleration unto them; and that is, by a free and plain Retractation of their gross Errors. And for an evidence of their fallacious way of Speaking and Writing, besides what was quoted and proved at the former Meeting,

to prove them grosly Erroneous, concerning Christ, his Humanity, and Incarnation, his Soul, Body, Flesh and Blood; I brought a Quotation out of that, call'd, *A Testimony for the true Christ*, printed 1668, and given forth (as in the Title-Page) from some of them call'd Quakers. In page 4. "As he "speaks of Humane, with relation to Nature and Body, it hath relation "to the Earth, or *Humus*, the Ground, of which Man was made, which "the first Man is of, not the second (tho' he was really Man too,) but "Humane or Humanity in the other sence, with relation to Gentleness, "Mercifulness, and the like, this we know, was, and is, in the Image "of God, in which Man was made; and his Gentleness, Kindness, Mer-"cifulness, &c. is manifested in Christ, who is the Image of the invi-"sible God, and First-Born of every Creature; which Image is not earth-"ly, for that must be put off, but heavenly, and so to be put on by "all that come to know the Glory of the terrestrial in its place, and "the true and real *Humanity*, as opposed to that Cruelty, Envy and In-"humanity, which is got up in Man since the Fall; so that Humanity "and the Unreasonableness of Beasts are two things.

Note, Thus we see how they own *Christ*'s *Humanity*, not in the sence of Scripture, and of all sound Christians, *viz.* That the *Word* did take the real Nature of Man, consisting of Soul and Body, into a *Personal Union with Himself*, his *Divinity* and *Humanity* being two Natures distinguished in him, but not divided; and that he took a Body of Flesh and Blood, the same in Nature with ours, even our earthly Nature, like to us in all things, but without Sin; but this they plainly deny, That Christ had *Humanity*, as it signifies Earthly; but they tell in what sence they mean his *Humanity*, *viz.* as it signifies *Gentleness*, *Mercifulness*, as opposed to *Cruelty*, *Envy*, *and the unreasonableness of Beasts*; in which sence they may affirm all this of Christ's Divinity and Godhead, That his Godhead is Humane, *i. e.* Gentle, Merciful, Kind, and yet believe not one tittle of Christ's Humanity as the Scripture holds it forth; that is, that he was really made of a Woman, and had his Flesh of her *Substance*; but this they not only here deny, but *G. F.* expresly denyeth, *That Christ's Body was Earthly or of the Earth*; G. M. p. 322.

He quotes his Opponent saying, *That Christ had and hath a Carnal Body, —— A Carnal and Humane Body united to his Divinity.* In opposition to which he saith, *And Carnal Humane is from the Ground, Humane Earthly, the first Adam's Body, and Christ was not from the Ground, let all People read what thou sayst; but he was from Heaven, his Flesh came down from above, his Flesh which was the Meat, his Flesh came down from Heaven.*

Again, He quotes his Opponent saying, *That the Flesh of Christ is not in them*; he answers, *The Saints eat his Flesh, and they that eat his Flesh, hath it within them.*

Again, He quotes his Opponent, *That there is as much difference between a Body and a Spirit, as there is between Light and Darkness*; he Answers, *Christ's Body is Spiritual, and that which is Spiritual does not differ from the Spirit*;

Spirit; and ſo there is a ſpiritual Body, and there is a natural Body; and there is a ſpiritual Man, and there is a natural Man, and each hath their Body.

Note, He plainly here denies a difference or diſtinction *between Chriſt's Body of Fleſh and his Spirit*, for he ſaith, *The Saints eat his Fleſh, and they that eat his Fleſh, hath it in them.* Now what Fleſh can they have of Chriſt in them, but what is meerly Spirit? whereas his Opponent (and all Chriſtians, when they ſpeak of Chriſts Fleſh, they) meant a real Body, as real as the Body of any other Man. And whereas *G. F.* ſaith Chriſt's Fleſh was not from the Ground or Earth; the Scripture ſaith no ſuch thing, but the contrary, that he did partake of the ſame Fleſh and Blood with the Children, wherefore he is not aſham'd to call them Brethren * *G. F.* doth both Ignorantly and Fallaciouſly play and quible about the Word *Carnal*, againſt his Opponent, who ſaid Chriſt had a *Carnal Body*; he Anſwers, *Carnal, indeed, is Death, ſaith the Scripture*; but here he belyes the Scripture; it ſaith not, the Carnal Body is Death, but to be Carnally-minded is Death. Could *G. F.* be ſo ſottiſh, as not to diſtinguiſh between a Carnal Body, and a Carnal Mind? His Opponents who ſaid, Chriſt had a Carnal Body united to the Divinity, they meant not Carnal, as it ſignifies Vicious or Corrupted, but as it ſignifies Material, *i. e.* a real Body, as real a Bodily Subſtance, as any other Man hath; and tho' Chriſt's Body now in Heaven is a Spiritual Body, yet it is a Body ſtill, and the ſame Body in Subſtance it was on Earth. And when it was on Earth, it was both a Material Body, and yet, in a ſenſe, a Spiritual, *i. e.* a pure, immaculate Body, without all ſtain of Sin, a moſt holy Body; and, in the like ſenſe, it might be ſaid, even when on Earth, it was a heavenly Body, to wit, as oppoſed to ſinful, corrupt, and tainted with Sin; and not only ſo, but in reſpect of its miraculous Conception by the Holy Ghoſt, and the holy and heavenly Virtues it was endued with above the Body of *Adam*, in Innocency: And thus the compariſon is made betwixt the Firſt *Adam*, and the Second; the firſt Man, even as he was in Innocency, is of the Earth, Earthly; his Body was Created or Made by God Almighty, but was neither ſo wonderfully framed, nor endued with ſuch excellent Virtues as our Lord's Body was: Tho' the Subſtance of both was the ſame in *Specie* or *Kind*, yet the difference was great, both in the manner of Production, and the Virtues and Properties wherewith Chriſt's Body was endued above *Adam*'s Body, and chiefly in reſpect of the Hypoſtatical and Perſonal Union, betwixt Chriſt's Body or Fleſh, and the Eternal Word, Eternally Begotten of the Father. It was an old Hereſie of the *Manichees*, That Chriſt's Body that was Born of the Virgin, had no part of her Body, but did penetrate her Body, as the Beams of the Sun penetrate Chriſtal, and did entirely come from Heaven; which Hereſie was reviv'd by *Menno*, a *Dutch-man*, but is effectually and ſolidly refuted by *Calvin*, in his *Inſtitutions*, *lib.* 2. *c.* 13. And as to the Quakers arguing from 1 *Cor.* 15, 47. *The firſt man of the earth, earthly, the ſecond Man, the Lord, from heaven*, that therefore his Body had not an earthly Subſtance, which is the ſame Argument *Manichæus* uſed of old; *Calvin* anſwereth ſolidly thus, *Manichæus aereum fabricatur Corpus, quia vocetur Chriſtus ſecundus Adam de*

* *Heb.* 2. 11, 14.

Cælo Cæleſtis; at neq; illic eſſentiam corporis Cæleſtem inducit Apoſtolus ſed vim ſpiritualem quæ à Chriſto diffuſa nos vivificat, Sect. 2. i. e. "*Manichæus* maketh "him (*viz.* Chriſt) to have a Body of Air, becauſe he is call'd the Se-"cond *Adam*, from heaven, heavenly: But neither doth the Apoſtle there "infer, that the Eſſence of his Body is heavenly, but that there is a ſpi-"ritual Virtue, which, being diffuſed from Chriſt, doth quicken us.

Again, Whereas *G. W.* ſaith, *Art.* 7. of that Paper, "Our really Be-"lieving and Confeſſing the Lord Jeſus Chriſt his Paſſion, Sufferings, "Death, Atonement, and Reconciliation made for us, and his Reſurrec-"tion, Aſcention, and Glorification (as without us) according to Scri-"pture cannot be to allegorize theſe away, as if only tranſacted within us, as "we have been unduly accuſed, for they were really done, and tranſacted "without us, by our Bleſſed Lord Jeſus Chriſt, tho' our true knowledge of the "Power and Effect of his Reſurrection, and Fellowſhip of his Sufferings, "and our being conformable to his Death, muſt be experienc'd within us, "if ever we live and reign with him. And in their Paper annexed, *Art.* 2. "they ſay, we ſincerely Believe and Confeſs, that Jeſus of *Nazareth*, who "was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, is the true Meſſiah, the very Chriſt, the "Son of the Living God, to whom all his Prophets gave Witneſs. And "we do highly value his Death, Sufferings, Works, Offices, and Merits, "for the Redemption and Salvation of Mankind, together with his Laws, "Doctrine and Miniſtry.

Note, That all this ſeemingly fair Confeſſion, cannot but be judged extremely Fallacious, ſeeing they will not Retract any of their former aſſertions expreſly contradictory to the ſame, as is in great part already proved, out of the above-given Quotations. How do they ſincerely Confeſs, that Jeſus of *Nazareth*, who was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, was the very Chriſt, the Son of the Living God, ſeeing they profeſs to be of one Faith with *W. P.* who ſaith, *That that Outward Perſon that Suffered* [*at* Jeruſalem] *was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny*, as above-quoted? And to be of *E. B.*'s Faith, who denyeth that Chriſt is in Heaven in our Nature? And of *G. F.*'s Faith, who denyeth, That Chriſt's Body was from the Earth? But yet more fully to detect their Fallacies.

Whereas *G. W.* ſaith, *Their really Believing and Confeſſing Chriſt's Paſſion, Sufferings, Death, Atonement, and Reconciliation, made for us, &c. cannot be to allegorize theſe away, as if only tranſacted within us, as we have been unduly accuſed.* To detect his Fallacy here, *Note*, I know none that accuſe them, for holding that Chriſt's Birth and Death was only tranſacted within them; they grant that a Man call'd Jeſus of *Nazareth*, was outwardly Born and Suffered Death; but ſome of the chief of them have ſaid, That that Man was not properly the Chriſt, nor Son of God, but was by the metonymy of the thing Containing for the thing Contained ſo called; ſo *W. P.* as above-quoted. Next they make his being outwardly Slain, and his Blood outwardly Shed, and what was outwardly tranſacted by him, both Actively and Paſſively, a Figure of what he was to do and ſuffer in Men, of his inward Crucifying, his Blood inwardly Shed, his Burial, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion within them. Theſe outward tranſactions, ſaith *W. P.* are ſo ma-

ny

ny facile repreſentations of what was to be accompliſhed in Men, as above-quoted, and *G. W.* beſide the Proofs already given out of his Books to that Effect, he hath lately affirmed in his * *Antidote againſt the Venom of the Snake*, Printed in the Year 1697, That *that Blood of his* [*viz.* Chriſt's outward Blood] *as well as the Water that came out of his Side with it, had an* ALLEGORICAL *and* MYSTERIOUS SIGNIFICATION, *as well as an Outward and Literal, even of the Spiritual Blood and Water of Life, which Chriſt, our High Prieſt, Sprinkleth, and really Waſheth our Hearts and Conſciences withal, which, we hope, no ſenſible Soul will ſay, is an Outward or Literal Sprinkling or Waſhing, but an Inward and Spiritual.* * *Antidote* p. 39.

Note, When we charge *G. W.* and his Brethren with Allegorizing away Chriſt's Birth, Paſſion, Death, Burial, Reſurrection, Blood, Atonement, and Reconciliation made for us, *&c.* the ſenſe is obvious, which is this, That tho' they grant, that a Man called Chriſt was outwardly Born, Dyed, had his Blood ſhed, *&c.* yet all this was an Allegory, and had an Allegorical Signification of Chriſt truly and really (without an Allegory) Born within them, Crucified and Dead within them, his Blood ſhed within them, Buried, Riſen, Aſcended within them; Atonement, Reconciliation made within them. Now, that this is ſo, we have *G. W.*'s plain Confeſſion, in the Words juſt now quoted. So that, according to him, Chriſt's Sufferings without, his Blood ſhed without, is the Allegory, or Allegorical Signification of Chriſt's Sufferings within, of his Blood ſhed within, the Atonement made within, as *Hagar* and *Sarah*, who were real Women, yet as *Paul* hath declar'd, they are an *Allegory* of the Two Covenants, and Types or Figures of them, and as far ſhort of the things ſignified by them, as the Type is ſhort of the Subſtance, or thing ſignified; for that is the true definition of an *Allegory*, *Where one thing is expreſſed, and another thing is underſtood*. Now if Chriſt's Birth, Sufferings, Blood, *&c.* without Men, be an *Allegory*, or Allegorical Signification of Chriſt's Birth, Sufferings, Blood ſhed and ſprinkled within Men; that Within muſt be the Reality, or Excellent thing ſignified, or typified by the outward; but both cannot be the Allegory, as to ſay, that as Chriſt's Blood without us is the *Allegory* of his Blood within, ſo his Blood within is the *Allegory* of Chriſt's Blood without; this is as great Nonſenſe, as who would ſay, as *Hagar* and *Sarah* were an *Allegory* of the Two Covenants, ſo the Two Covenants are an *Allegory* of *Hagar* and *Sarah*. And thus *G. W.* and his Brethren ſtand juſtly charged with Allegorizing away Chriſt's outward Birth, Sufferings, Blood, Atonement, by making them the Allegory of his Birth, Sufferings, Blood, Atonement, made within Men, tho' they deny not Chriſt's Birth, Death, Blood without, ſimply as Hiſtorically related; yet ſeeing they deny the Merit and Efficacy of his Death and Blood without, and of what he did and ſuffered without us, they are juſtly charg'd to *Allegorize it away*, that is, to make no other account of it, than of the Hiſtory of *Hagar* and *Sarah*, and other Types, Symbols and Allegories of the Old Teſtament.

Beſides, If Men will be wilful denyers of the Hiſtorical Truth of Chriſt's outward Birth, Death, Burial, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, according to *G. W.*'s

and

and his Brethren's way and method of expounding Scripture, we have no way to convince them of their Error.

If we bring *Isaiah* 9. 6. to prove that *Isaiah* Prophesied of Christ's Birth, and that the Child that should be Born, should be both *God* and *Man*, and his Mother should be a *Virgin*, according to *Isaiah* 7. 14. And if we bring *Isaiah* 53. to prove that *Christ should be wounded for our Sins, be killed, be buried, and make his grave with the wicked*; or, *That Christ should suffer without the Camp*; they may Answer, All these, and the like places, are to be meant not of any Birth, Death or Burial of a Christ without us, but of Christ Born, Slain, and Buried in Men; and, for their Proof, vouch *G. W.*'s Authority and his Brethren's to confirm it, who, as above-quoted, have expounded these places of Christ Born, Slain, Buried, within Men. But if *G. W.* will say, these and other the like places have two meanings, one Outward and Literal, and the other Inward and Spiritual; to this I say, First, *G. W.* in his *Voice of Wisdom*, pag 21. hath severely blamed his Opponent *T. D.* for giving two meanings to one place. I agree to the most Judicious and Orthodox Expositors of Scripture, that the Scriptures have but one sense or meaning, properly and strictly speaking, *viz.* That the thing principally and properly intended, is but one, and what other senses or meanings may be put upon some places of Scripture, besides that, is rather an Allusion or Allegory, than the real meaning, which, so far as we have Scripture warrant, is allowed, as *Paul*'s calling *Hagar* and *Sarah* an Allegory, but otherwise is dangerous, and in the present case is most Heretical, as in *G. W.*'s and his Brethrens making *Christ's Birth, Sufferings, Death, Burial without Men the Allegory*, and his Birth, Sufferings, Death, Burial, within, the Reality and Substance, or thing principally intended in these places of Scripture.

That the Spirit of God, with his sanctifying Gifts and Graces, is called Water of Life, and Living Waters, whereby God doth really Purify and Cleanse the Hearts and Consciences of the Faithful; and that this Work of Sanctification is Inward and Spiritual in them, is no part of the Dispute or Controversie; for this is not only granted, but earnestly taught and pleaded for against *Pelagians* and others who deny it, or at least the necessity of such an inward and spiritual Operation. Therefore *G. W.* in this, as in most of his late Defences, doth purposely mistake the true Case, to hide his vile Heresie, as if the debate betwixt him and his Opponents, were only about the inward Operations of the Spirit of God, for the cleansing and sanctifying the Hearts of the Faithful; but this is his ordinary Fallacy. The true state of the Question then is this, Whether there is any *Inward Blood* or *Water* that Christ Crucified in Men lets out, or is pressed out of him, crucified within them, that is the *Blood of Atonement*, is the *Price* and *Ransom*, and Meritorious Cause of the Remission of our Sins; is the *Satisfactory and propitiatory Offering for Sin*, either in whole or in part? Also, whether any such *supposed Blood or Water or Spirit*, thus flowing from Christ, as Crucified and Wounded within Men, is the meritorious and procuring Cause either of Men's Justification before God, or of the saving and sanctifying Graces of the Holy Spirit; and whether the Gift of the Holy

Holy Spirit, given to Believers, with the ſanctifying Graces thereof, proceeds from Chriſt Crucified within, having made the *Atonement and Satisfaction by his Blood* ſhed within, Riſen and Aſcended within, Sitting at the Right Hand of God within Men, making Interceſſion for them; or from Chriſt, as he was crucified without us, having made the Atonement and Satisfaction without us, by his Blood ſhed without us, Riſen and Aſcended and ſat down at the Right Hand of God without us, and there Interceding for us. This is the true ſtate of the Controverſie; all true Chriſtians ſay, that all this is from Chriſt without us; as outwardly Born, Crucified, Riſen, Aſcended, from him thus only conſidered as without us; all Believers have the free gift of the Remiſſion of Sins, free Juſtification freely by God's Grace [being the real effect of Chriſt's Purchaſe, and of the Merit of his Precious Blood] and alſo the Holy Spirit, with the ſanctifying Gifts and Graces thereof, inwardly to renew and ſanctifie them. So that the Work of Chriſt or of the Spirit in Believers, is not at all, either in whole or in part, to ſuffer for our Sins, or to procure by *way of Merit*, the pardon of our Sins, and our Peace and Reconciliation with God, for that's wholly and only done by Chriſt without us; but to work the ſincere Faith of all that he hath done and ſuffer'd for us without us, and give us the Spiritual Knowledge and Comfort of it, in our Hearts and Souls.

The *Plaiſter* and *healing Medicine* of Chriſt's Body and Blood was prepared for us, when he gave his Precious Body to be broken for us, and his Blood to be ſhed for us; this was once done, and is no more to be done again; *Chriſt having once dyed, dyeth no more*; by the one Offering of himſelf once only offered without us [his Soul, Body, and Blood] he hath intirely and completely prepared the *wholſom Medicine and Food of Life for us*: But now the work of Chriſt, and his Spirit in us, is to apply it effectually to us [that is] to enable us effectually to apply it to our ſelves for our Eternal Health and Salvation; to give us a Spiritual diſcovery and ſight of that living Food, a Hunger and Appetite after it, and to teach us ſpiritually by Faith to receive it, and feed upon it, to eat his Fleſh, and drink his Blood, not by the bodily Mouth, but by the Mouth of the Soul, which is Faith, a true and living Faith wrought in us by the powerful Operation of Chriſt in us, or his Spirit. And tho' the Blood of Chriſt that both juſtifieth and ſanctifieth is without us, yet the application by Faith is within, both for our Juſtification and Sanctification.

Note again, That as *G. W.* doth fallaciouſly ſtate the Queſtion, concerning Men's being Cleanſed, *i. e.* Juſtified and Sanctified *by the Blood of Chriſt*, as is above-ſhewed, ſo he argueth moſt fallaciouſly for his falſe Notion *of a Blood of Chriſt within Men*, to be the Atonement, by the merit whereof they are Cleanſed from Sin; as becauſe the Operation of the Spirit of God is within Men, whereby he applieth to them the *Merit, Virtue* and *Efficacy* of Chriſt's Blood, (which application, by a *Metaphorical Speech* is call'd in Scripture, *A ſprinkling the Conſcience*,) that therefore the Blood of Chriſt is Inward; which is the like Sophiſtical and Nonſenſical Argument with that of *G. P. The Saints eat the Fleſh of Chriſt, therefore they*

they have it in them. Thus they both argue from a Metaphorical Eating and Sprinkling or Cleansing to a *Literal* or *Material*; as because what Men eat of *Material Food*, they receive it into them; so because they eat *Christ's Flesh*, they have it in them; and because the *Blood of Christ Sprinkles* the Hearts and Consciences of the Faithful, therefore that *Blood* is in them, not considering the application here, both with respect to Eating and Sprinkling, is not Material but Spiritual, by Faith, as Christ hath plainly explained it, that *to eat Christ is to believe in him*; to eat his Flesh and drink his Blood, is sincerely *to believe* with the Heart, that Christ gave his *Body of Flesh* to be broken for us, *and his Blood* to be shed for us, for the Remission of our Sins, and both for our Justification and Sanctification, and eternal Salvation. Joh. 6. 35. *He that cometh to me shall never hunger, he that believeth in me shall never thirst*; and verse 40. *This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.*

Again, Whereas they say in that Printed Paper above-quoted, signed by *G. W.* and Thirty more, " We do highly value his Death, Sufferings, " Works, Offices and Merits for the Redemption and Salvation of Mankind. That all this is extremely Fallacious doth largely appear from what is above-quoted: Do they highly value his Death and Sufferings, when some among them have Printed, as above-quoted, That when they come to the Operation of the Spirit or Light Within them, they will cease remembring Christs Death at *Jerusalem*. Do they value Christ's Sufferings and Death, *&c.* who deny it to be the Gospel that Christ impowered the Apostles to Preach; for which hear what they say in their Book above-quoted, call'd, *A Testimony for the true Christ*, &c. p. 16. Their Opponent they quote saying, [p. 16.] *Christ impowered the Apostles to go forth to Preach the Gospel to the ends of the Earth; which Gospel was his Sufferings, Death and Resurrection, Baptizing in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, &c. To this they Answer, " The Gospel which they Preached was Everlasting, it was the Pow- " er of God to Salvation, to as many as Believed both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*; " But were his Sufferings, Death, *&c.* Everlasting? Is this good Doctrine, say they. So that according to them, it is not good Doctrine, but bad, to Preach Christ's Sufferings, Death, *&c.* to be the Gospel either in whole or in part; for their reason is of equal force against that Doctrine either in whole or in part, The Gospel is *Everlasting*, but Christ's Death and Sufferings, *&c.* [*Note* the *&c.* which both the Opponent and they add] is not Everlasting, for that they say was Temporal, therefore Christ's Death and Sufferings is not the Gospel; and by this their profound Logick, or rather beggarly Sophistry, nothing is the Gospel, but that which is Everlasting, *i. e.* was from Eternity to Eternity; and thus, according to them, nothing is the *Gospel*, but the *Light Within*, because that is *Everlasting*; the Power, the Spirit, the Light is *Everlasting*, and therefore that only is the Gospel. But tho' the Spirit, and Power, and Light, was and is Everlasting, yet it was not within them from Everlasting, because they were not from Everlasting; and therefore by their Logick, as the Light or Spirit is in them, and as the Gift of God to them, it is no more the Gospel, than

Christ's

Christ's Death and Sufferings, *&c.* because they had it not within them from Everlasting, if they will acknowledge themselves to be *Creatures*, Created and Made by the Great *Creator* in Time. But they quibble Sophistically upon the word Everlasting; for tho' Christ's Suffering and Death were not Everlasting, yet both the Merit, Virtue and Efficacy of them, both for procuring Remission of Sin, and the Holy Spirit with the sanctifying Gifts and Graces thereof, was from the beginning of the World, and will continue to the end of the World; yea, and to all Eternity; and the Doctrine of it in some measure was Preached from the beginning, as God revealed it first to our first Parents, and then successively to others of his Holy Prophets, and was held forth, both by Prophecy, Promise and Sacrifices to the Faithful.

Again, They are grosly Fallacious, when they say in that Printed Paper, *We do highly value and esteem his Sufferings, Death, Precious Blood, and whole Sacrifice for Sinners* —— *Works, Offices, and Merits for the Redemption and Salvation of Mankind.* But, what do they mean by Christ's Merits? Do they mean the Merits of what Christ hath done for them, without them, suffered without them, his Righteousness without them, his Blood shed without them, so as thereby to be justified? Nay, The following Quotations will sufficiently evidence the contrary; *viz.* That not the Righteousness or *Merits*, or Blood of Christ shed without us, but the *Merits* of Christ within them, his Righteousness wrought in them, his Blood shed within them, the Blood of his Divinity or Godhead, but not of his Humanity or Humane Blood, by which they are justified; for further proof of which hear what *G. W.* saith in his *Voice of Wisdom*, p. 48. where he blames *T. Danson*, and chargeth it on him to be false Doctrine held by him, *That there were two Righteousnesses of Christ, the one without the Saints to justify them, and the other within the Saints that did sanctifie them.* And in p. 26. he chargeth *T. Danson* with Ignorance, *for his asserting two Righteousnesses of Christ,* [*the one without us for Justification, the other within us for Sanctification.*] And in p. 35. *He argueth against Justification by a Righteousness of Christ without us, thus, If it be the same Christ that justifies and sanctifies, then it's but one and the same Righteousness, which effecteth both those in and for the Saints.*

And in p. 19. he expresly defends that *Popish Argument* used by *S. Fisher*, [the very same Argument is used by *Bellarmin, De Justif.*] *That because evil Works are meritorious of Condemnation, therefore good Works* [*wrought by us in the Spirit*] *are a meritorious cause of our Justification*: But *T. Danson* doth effectually Answer the Argument, by denying the Consequence; and that it can have no force unless the good Works we work, even by the help of the Spirit, were, in all respects, *Perfect and Sinless*, and that we had always *perfectly* fulfilled the Law from first to last, which no Man ever did but Christ. And he gives another good reason, why he denyeth the Consequence, *Because the Righteousness which God works in us is but* Finite, *as well as other effects*; his sense is obvious, No Righteousness can *Merit* our Justification before God, but that which is of an *Infinite value*; and therefore the Righteousness of a meer Man, had it been Perfect and Sinless from the

Voice of Wisdom, p. 36.

firſt moment of his Life to his Death, could not be of Merit for the Juſtification of others; and, indeed, ſtrictly ſpeaking, not of *Merit* for his own Juſtification; he could only have been juſtified by his own good Works (aſſiſted to do them by the Spirit) by fulfilling the terms of the Law or Covenant of Works; but becauſe Chriſt was not meer Man, but both God and Man, therefore his Righteouſneſs and Obedience is of that Infinite Value and Merit, that is ſufficient for all that lay hold on it for Juſtification by a true and lively Faith. Now to both theſe good and ſolid Reaſons *G. W.* Anſwers moſt Ignorantly; Firſt in aſſerting, That the good Works which we work by the Spirit, or which the Spirit works in us are Perfect, and are the fulfilling of the Law, and therefore deſerving Juſtification; but to this I have anſwered above, and diſcovered his Ignorance, [ſee the Firſt Part, *p.* 13.] To his 2d Reaſon *G. W.* Anſwers, *The Righteouſneſs which God effects in us is not Finite, but Infinite,* [Voice of Wiſdom, p. 36.] *for Chriſt is God's Righteouſneſs, and Chriſt is formed in us,* Gal. 4. 19. *and ſo that Righteouſneſs which God works in us by his Spirit, is of the ſame Kind and Nature with that which worketh it, for the Saints are made partakers of the Divine Nature.*

Thus we ſee, how he magnifies the Righteouſneſs wrought by the Spirit in Men; not only to be Perfect with a Sinleſs Perfection, but *DEIFIES* it, ſo as to make it equal to God himſelf, arguing that the Righteouſneſs which God works in us, is of the ſame *Nature* with that which worketh it; ſurely whatever is of the ſame *Nature* with God, is equal to God, yea, is God; for, becauſe Chriſt, *as he is the Eternal Word,* is of the *ſame Nature* with God, therefore he is equal with God, and is God.

But, obſerve a prodigious Fallacy in *G. W.* to defend his Blaſphemy. In his *Truth and Innoc.* p. 60. in defence of that paſſage above-quoted out of his *Voice of Wiſdom,* he ſaith, *My meaning ſimply of the word* [*Infinite*] *was that God's Righteouſneſs, which he effects in us, is Everlaſting, and without end,* Pſal. 119. 142. *And Chriſt is ſaid to be of God made unto us Wiſdom and Righteouſneſs, and Sanctification and Redemption,* 1 Cor. 1. 30. *I hope* (ſaith he) *none will deny him to be Infinite, or his work of Righteouſneſs, and the effect thereof to be quietneſs and aſſurance for ever.* And thus he would heal himſelf by giving us his ſenſe of the word Infinite, that he meant ſimply, that it was Everlaſting and without end. But to detect this prodigiouſly dull Sophiſtry, [I call it not prodigious for the Wit of it, but the Dulneſs of it,] the nature of *G. W.*'s Argument did not only carry the ſenſe of the word *Infinite* to be endleſs, but to be every way Infinite, his Argument being grounded on this, That that Righteouſneſs which God worketh in us *is of the ſame Kind and Nature* with that which worketh it: Now the Nature of God is not only endleſs, but Infinite every way; his Righteouſneſs and Holineſs not only extendeth beyond all Times and Ages, but beyond all *Degrees and Meaſures of Created Perfection.*

But whatever ſenſe the word *Infinite* may be allowed in other caſes to have; as to ſay a Nation is Infinitely Rich, as *Nahum* 3. 9. yet in this caſe of the Controverſie betwixt *T. Danſon* and *G. W.* the word *Infinite* can have no ſuch limited or ſtrained ſenſe; neither did *T. Danſon* underſtand

it

it in that ſenſe, as only to ſignifie *Endleſs*. And *G. W.* did he know the true Law of Diſputants, ſhould know, That when he anſwereth to his Opponent's Argument, he ſhould take the word of his Opponent in the ſenſe of his Opponent, becauſe the force of the Argument lies upon that ſenſe. For *T. Danſon*'s Argument had not this ſenſe, That becauſe the Righteouſneſs that God works in Men, is not Endleſs, therefore it is not Meritorious of Juſtification; for granting it to be Endleſs [that is, Infinite in *G. W.*'s ſenſe] as the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith of Charity, it never faileth, every degree of it is Endleſs; but it will not therefore follow, that it is meritorious of Juſtification, becauſe it hath no end of duration, for ſo the Soul it ſelf ſhould be meritorious of Juſtification, becauſe it is Endleſs; yea, the Souls of bad Men and Devils are Endleſs and Infinite in *G. W.*'s ſenſe; do they therefore merit Juſtification? But the force of *T. Danſon*'s Argument lyeth in this, *That Righteouſneſs alone can be meritorious of our Juſtification before God, that is Infinite in Value and Worth* (that is) *equivalent, and infinitely more than equivalent, to the Righteouſneſs, not only of all the moſt holy Angels that never ſinned, but of all the Men, that ever lived or ſhall live, had they* (by Suppoſition) *lived as holily and righteouſly as the holy Law of God required them to live from firſt to laſt; yet ſuch a Righteouſneſs as this, of all ſuch holy Angels and Men, being but a Finite Righteouſneſs with reſpect to its intrinſick worth and value, could not be ſufficiently meritorious for the Juſtification of one Man that has ſinned, tho' ſuppoſe but once all his Life time.*

But becauſe the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, to wit, his moſt holy and perfect Obedience, which he performed without us, was not the Righteouſneſs of a *meer Man*, but of him, who was both *God and Man*, therefore it is an *Infinite Righteouſneſs*, *i. e.* of Infinite value before God, by way of merit to obtain the Juſtification of true Penitents and Believers; and when ſound Chriſtian-Teachers ſay, The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which he performed without us, for our Juſtification, is an Infinite Righteouſneſs, they mean not that it was *Phyſically Infinite*, but Morally, *i. e.* of Infinite value before God, by reaſon of the *Hypoſtatical Union* of the Humane Nature of Chriſt with the *Eſſential and Eternal Word*.

But *G. W.* thought to excuſe *S. F.* and himſelf from the imputation of *Popery*, on the Point of *Juſtification*, and that very handſomly, why? becauſe the Quakers ſay, It's only the works that they work by the Spirit's help, that are *meritorious* of Juſtification. But this will not excuſe them from *Popery*; for even *Bellarmine*, a great Popiſh Author, and the other Popiſh Authors, plead only for the merit of ſuch good Works, (which merit by Condignity,) as wrought by the help of the Holy Spirit aſſiſting them.

And his Sophiſtry is as dull, in his drawing an Argument from 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. "That Chriſt is made unto us of God, Wiſdom and Righteouſneſs, and "Sanctification and Redemption, therefore that Believers are juſtified by an "Infinite Righteouſneſs wrought in them, and that Chriſt is formed in them, "*Gal.* 4. 19.

And thus he will have Christ, as held forth in that Text, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. not to be Christ God-Man without us, from and by whom we receive Justification and Redemption, and also divine Wisdom and Sanctification, by his holy Spirit that he sendeth into our Hearts, and by his holy Doctrine outwardly taught us, but Christ formed in us; he will have to be all this unto us, and Christ formed in us is the Seed, and the Seed is God over all blessed for ever, as above-quoted, both out of *G. W.* and *W. P.* But what then is become of his *Exposition* that he gave in his *Judgment Fixed* above-quoted, That this Birth, *viz.* 'Christ formed in true Believers, *is not Christ* 'Jesus; for he is that incorruptible Seed and Word of Life, which begets, 'forms and brings forth the Soul of Man into his own Nature and Image; 'and so Christ may be said to be formed in us *in a Mysterious and Elegant* 'way of speaking, the *Property* and *Effect* being put for the *Cause*.

Judgment Fixed, p. 330.

Thus we see how he wavers to and fro, betwixt *So* and *No*, and *No* and *So*, *sometimes This, and sometimes That; and sometimes neither This nor That*; a Phrase that *S. F.* used to some of his Opponents, but very justly apply'd to *G. W.* But differing senses and meanings are more tolerable for a Man to put on his Words, than plain contradictions, and especially in Matters Fundamental, as these are.

Next, let us hear what *W. P.* hath said on the Doctrine of Justification, and how *J. Wyeth* in his *Switch* defends him.

W. Penn in his *Serious Apology* p. 148, gives the charge of his Opponent thus, *That we deny Justification by the Righteousness which Christ hath fulfilled in his own Person for us* (wholly without us) *and therefore deny the Lord that bought us*; *W. P.* Answers; *And indeed this we deny and boldly affirm it in the Name of the Lord, to be the Doctrine of Devils, and an Arm of the Sea of Corruption, which does now deluge the whole World.*

What saith *Jos. Wyeth*, that hardy Champion, to this, *Switch* p. 238. *Yes it is still true, and that we do deny, and boldly affirm to be the Doctrine of Devils; and for our so denying and affirming, we have the warrant of Holy Writ, wherein is abundantly testifyed of the Spirit of Christ in Man, to which he must be obedient in order to his Justification*; for which he quotes *Rom.* 3. 24, 28. *Rom.* 5. 1. *Titus* 3. 7. and concludes *then not wholly without us.*

Note, Here *J. Wyeth* acts the dull Sophister as much as his Elder Brother *G. W.* by perverting the true state of the Question, as is their frequent manner. The Question is not, What is *necessary*, by way of *Instrument* or *Instrumental Application*, or *Preparatory Condition*, in order to Justification; such as Faith and Repentance; for such are granted to be *necessary* in order to *Justification*, as the stretching out the Hand is necessary to receive an Alms, or free Gift, and the opening the *Mouth* is necessary to receive *Food*; but the true state of the Question is, What is the *procuring* and *purchasing* Cause of our *Justification* before God, *by way of Merit*, or the *Meritorious Cause of our Justification*; whether the *Righteousness* of Christ that he wrought *without us*, by his *Active* and *Passive Obedience*, above Sixteen Hundred Years ago, Yea, or Nay; If Yea, surely that is *wholly without us*; but this says *W. P.* and *J. W.* is a Doctrine of Devils; and *G. W.* chargeth *T. D.* with ignorance

rance and falſe Doctrine for affirming it, as above-quoted; and yet it is the very plain Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, *Iſa.* 53. 4, 5, 11, 12. *Rom.* 3. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28. *Rom.* 4. 4, 11. *Rom.* 5. 18. *Gal.* 3. 22. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

There are other Arguments which *W. P.* uſeth in his *Serious Apology*, ſome of which I ſhall mention, not to refute them, for the leaſt Child in Chriſtianity may do that, but to ſhow his Error; one of which is, *Death came by actual Sin, not imputative, therefore Juſtification unto Life comes by actual Righteouſneſs, and not imputative.* Another is, *This ſpeaks Peace to the Wicked.* Another is, *Men are Dead and Alive at the ſame time by this Doctrine. Note*, He perverts the ſtate of the Queſtion; his Opponents do not ſay, That Wicked and Unſanctified Perſons are juſtified; but if none be juſtified, but who are Perfect vvith a Sinleſs Perfection, and have not the leaſt impurity, then neither *W. P.* nor any Quaker, ever vvas, or is juſtified; for vvhatever they boaſt of their Sinleſs Perfection, their vile Errors, Pride and Uncharitableneſs, as vvell as other their Imperfections, demonſtrate the contrary. Another of his Arguments is againſt our Juſtification by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs without us, *Our rejoycing muſt be in our ſelves and not in another*; thus perverting *Paul*'s Words, *Gal.* 6. 4. *But let every Man prove his own work, and then ſhall he have rejoycing in himſelf, and not in another.* But doth this exclude our rejoycing in Chriſt Jeſus our Head. who to be ſure is another? O ſad! How contrary to this is *Philip* 3. 3. *For we are the Circumciſion, which worſhip God in the Spirit, and rejoyce in Chriſt Jeſus, and have no confidence in the Fleſh*; by this Argument of *W. P.* he for himſelf and his Brethren (whoſe Faith he pretends to deliver) *renounces all Rejoycing, as well as Faith and Righteouſneſs, in Chriſt without us; yea, and in Chriſt within them alſo*; for Chriſt within them, if he be within them, is *Another.* Dare *W. P.* or *G. W.* ſay, Chriſt in *W. P.* or *G. W.* is *W. P.* or *G. W.*

But whereas *G. W.* in his Printed Paper above-quoted, call'd, *A Few Poſitions*, &c. ſaith, *We highly do value and eſteem his* (Chriſt's) *Sufferings, Death, Precious Blood, and whole Sacrifice for Sinners*: For a Proof of his Inſincerity and Sophiſtry in this, I ſhall produce ſome following Quotations, what *G. W.* means by his *Precious Blood*, and whether he put the due value upon Chriſt's Blood that was outwardly ſhed, or upon another ſort of inward Blood, I cannot ſay of his and his Brethrens inventing, but what they received from *Familiſts* and *Ranters*, tho' they pretend to have it by immediate Inſpiration, to wit, an inward Blood, that is the Atonement and Sacrifice for Sin, which Blood *G. W.* will not allow to be the Blood of Chriſt's Humanity, but of his Godhead.

G. W. in his *Truth Defended*, p. 66. quotes *C. Wade* ſaying, "The Lord "hath Bought us and Redeemed us, with the Precious Blood of his Humanity, and ſaith your imagined Chriſt [*viz.* their Notion of a Chriſt, whoſe "Blood is ſhed within them] never had any Humane Blood to Redeem "you with; and to prove it, he brings 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. *G. W.* Anſwers, That "Scripture, 1 *Pet.* 1. haſt thou perverted, as thou haſt done other Scriptures, to "thy own Deſtruction; for there he witneſſes to the Blood of the Lamb, which

"Redeemed

"Redeemed them from their vain Converſation, but doth not tell them of "Humane Blood to Redeem them with; for that which is Humane is "Earthly, but Chriſt whoſe Blood is Spiritual is Lord from Heaven, and "he is not an imagined Spirit, but a true Spirit. And what ſay'ſt thou "to this? Was that Humane Blood, which Chriſt ſaith, Except a Man "drink he hath no Life in him, and which cleanſed the Saints from all "Sin, who were Fleſh of Chriſt's Fleſh, and Bone of his Bone.

Note, Thus we ſee what Blood *G. W.* eſteems the *Precious Blood* of Chriſt, not his *Humane Blood*, or *Blood of his Humanity*, and that not only he denyeth that we are Redeemed or Cleanſed by any *Blood* of his *Humanity*, but denyeth that Chriſt had any *Humane Blood*, or *Blood of Humanity*, and giveth his Reaſon againſt it, That Humane is Earthly, but Chriſt, whoſe Blood is Spiritual, is Lord from Heaven.

But again, For a further evidence of his undervaluing the outward Blood of Chriſt, and denying it to be that Blood by which Chriſt purchaſed his Church, in his *Light and Life*, p. 56. *It is confeſſed* (ſaith he) *that God by his own Blood purchaſed to himſelf a Church*, Acts 20. 28. *Now the Blood of God, or that Blood that relates to God, muſt needs be Spiritual, he being a Spirit, and the Covenant of God is Inward and Spiritual.*

Note, This Quotation was lately publiſhed in the Printed Sheet, call'd, *An Account from* Colcheſter, above-mention'd; to which Seven Quakers at *Colcheſter* have given a pretended Anſwer, call'd, *Some Account from* Colcheſter, *&c.* In their Anſwer to this Quotation, they quibble Sophiſtically upon the Word Spiritual. We would ask theſe Men (ſay they) if God's own Blood be not Spiritual, whether it be Carnal, and the Blood of his Covenant ſuch alſo? But was not the Blood that was outwardly ſhed on the Croſs, which *John* ſaid he ſaw, and bare Record, real material Blood, as really as that of other Men: And granting it to be Spiritual, as Spiritual ſignifies Holy, as a Holy Man is a Spiritual Man, and yet is a Carnal Man with reſpect to his Body of Fleſh, yet it was Material and Corporal. But *G. W.* by Spiritual meant inward Blood, in Men and Women; and ſo expreſſed it; The Covenant (ſaith he) is Inward and Spiritual, and ſo is the Blood of it; ſo that *Spiritual* and *Inward* are with him *Synonymous*. But, for a further Anſwer, they quote a paſſage in *G. W.*'s *Antidote*, p. 233, 234. where he grants, contrary to his former Doctrine, That God purchaſed his Church, by Chriſt's *Natural* or *Outward* Blood, but not only by that, but *principally by the Spiritual Blood* or Life of Chriſt Jeſus; and this *Spiritual Blood* he holds to be *Inward* in Men, *The Blood is the Life, and the Life is the Light of Men*, as *W. Bailie* phraſed it, perverting and confounding two ſundry Texts of Scripture. But the tenor and tendency of *G. W.*'s former Arguments were altogether againſt Redemption or Juſtification, *by any natural or outward Blood whatſoever*; for Humane is Natural; but *Humane Blood G. W.* would by no means admit to be *the Blood of Chriſt*, by which Men are Redeemed: So now he will have God's own Blood to be no leſs than his own dear Son, and the Blood to be *both Natural and Outward, and Spiritual and Inward*, by which we are Redeemed; meaning by Inward Blood, his Life, Power and Spirit, in Men and Women,

Women; and yet, in contradiction to himself, he saith, *God's sparing not his own Son, but delivering him up for us all, includes the whole Sacrifice of Christ in Soul and Body, which were offered.*

Note, If Christ's Soul and Body without us, were the whole Sacrifice, the outward Blood being a part of his Body, then his Spirit, Life and Light in us, is no part of the Sacrifice; and yet in contradiction to this in his *Light and Life*, p. 44. He brings several Arguments and Scriptures, but all grosly perverted to prove *That Christ in us, offers up himself a living Sacrifice*, refering to *W. Burnets* Book, *cap. prim.* p. 31. Where the words are more largely quoted thus, out of *W. Smiths Primmer. We believe that Christ in us, doth offer up himself a living Sacrifice unto God for us, by which the Wrath and Justice of God is appeased towards us.* This layeth the whole stress upon Christ within Men, being the offering; but now *G. W.* would seem to give one part to Christ without, and another part to Christ within Men, to be the offering, and to the Blood shed without, that was Natural and Outward, and to the Blood shed within Men, that is Spiritual and Inward. But then surely he gives very little to the Blood shed without, that was but once, and was Natural Blood, the Blood of the Humanity; but he gives very much to the Inward Blood shed within Men, which is a more excellent Blood; it is the *Blood* not of the *Humanity*, but of the *Divinity*, and is shed many Thousands, yea, Millions of times, for it is shed in all Men, who have lived in several Ages of the World: And thus Christ hath offered up himself *Inwardly Millions of times*, and had his Blood inwardly shed to appease the Wrath and Justice of God; but this is directly contrary to the Scripture, that saith, That Christ *by one Offering* hath for ever *perfected* them that are Sanctified; and *by one Offering, once offered*, not *often* offered, *he hath appeared to put away sin*; and, as was Propheſied of him, a Body thou hast prepared me, not *two Bodies*, or *many Bodies*: And as Christ had not *two Bodies* to be offered for our Sins, so nor had he *two Bloods*, the Scripture never mentioneth any *Blood* of Christ but *one*; we no where read in Scripture of the *Bloods* of Christ, *plural*, but of *Blood*, *singular*. And according to *G. W.* the Blood of Christ, in his former Books, is but one, and that is the Inward Blood, the Blood of his Divinity, but not of his Humanity; yea, he hath denyed the Body of Christ to be any part of him, whereof he consisteth, as above-quoted, and consequently, nor was the outward Blood, shed on the Cross, any part of him.

Heb. 9.28. 10. 14. *Heb.* 8.

But suppose it were allowed to call the Spirit of Christ in Believers, or the sanctifying and refreshing Influences thereof, his *Blood*, by way of metaphor, as Wine is call'd in Scripture, the Blood of the Grape, and Christ calleth himself the Vine, and Believers in him the Branches, yet by no means can the Spirit, or influence thereof in Men, be call'd the Blood shed for remission of Sin, the Blood of Atonement, that by way of Merit and Satisfaction to Divine Justice, removes the guilt of Sin, and makes Peace betwixt God and Men; for whatever *Sacrifice* makes *Atonement* for Sin, must be *Slain*, and the *Blood* of the *Sacrifice* shed or poured forth, as the Beasts that were offered for Sin under the Law, behoved to be Slain, and their

their Blood to be ſhed, which were Types of Chriſt, who was outwardly to be ſlain, and his Blood outwardly ſhed, for without ſhedding of Blood there is no remiſſion, as the Scripture teſtifieth; the which ſheding of Blood muſt be by the Death of that, whoſe Body was to be Slain: Now the pouring and ſhedding of the Spirit of Chriſt, and his Graces and Gracious influences into the Hearts of the Faithful, is the effect of Chriſt's Death without us, as he was outwardly Slain and offered up for us, by way of Merit and Purchaſe as it is alſo the effect of his Mediation and Interceſſion for us now in Heaven by way of impetration and actual diſpenſation, having received power to give thoſe gifts to Men, as he is now at Gods Right Hand in Heaven, in his glorified Humanity, which he procured and purchaſed for them, when he was upon Earth, in his ſtate of Humiliation, by the proper Merit of his Obedience, both Active and Paſſive, who humbled himſelf and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Croſs; wherefore God hath exalted him, to be a Prince and a Saviour.

Coloſſ. 1. 20. And therefore it is, that the Blood of Chriſt by which he made peace for us, is called *the Blood of the Croſs*, becauſe it was ſhed, and poured forth on the Croſs, and he is ſaid to have reconciled us in his Body of Fleſh, through Death; all which beſpeaks that our Redemption, and Reconciliation by way of Purchaſe and Merit, was wholly done and tranſacted by Chriſt without us, and could not be done within us, by way of Sacrifice and Atonement, for that required the Sacrifice to be Slain, and the Blood thereof to be ſhed and poured forth. But the Authors of this abominable Hereſie, which teacheth that Chriſt in Man by his Blood ſhed in them, is the *offering* for Sin, and the Blood thus ſhed in them, is the Blood of Atonement, yea, *the Blood of the Croſs* within them, to make things ſeemingly conſiſt and hang together, they have invented an Inward Crucifixion and Killing of Chriſt in Men, as well as an inward ſhedding of his Blood in them, to anſwer, by way of Analogy, to the outward Killing of the Sacrifices under the old Teſtament. But when this Crucifying or Killing of Chriſt in Men, was, beſide many other queſtions about the manner of it, they are put hard to it to reſolve, and indeed the reſolution of it is impoſſible, for it implys not only manifeſt contradictions to Scripture, but to all true and right Reaſon, as much as the *Popiſh Tranſubſtantiation* doth. For as nothing can be properly ſaid, to have been Killed, but what was formerly alive; If Chriſt has been Killed, ſuppoſe in every Quaker, he behoved to be firſt alive in them; and as Chriſt in the Figure or Type, (as ſome of them call him) was Born long before he was outwardly crucified; for though when he was a Child, *Herod* ſought his Life, yet by his being taken by his Mother into *Egypt*, he was preſerved; and this very paſſage, of Chriſt's being perſecuted by *Herod*, ſoon after he was Born, the Quakers have made an Allegory, not that the inward is the Allegory of the outward [which were ſomewhat tolerable, as ſome of the Ancients have ſo Allegorized, though ſome went too far even ſo] but the outward is the Allegory of the inward, and as then there paſſed ſome conſiderable ſpace of time betwixt Chriſt's typical Birth in the outward, and his typical Crucifixion,

Crucifixion; so that being about Twelve Years of Age, he disputed with the Doctors, and about Thirty he began his Ministry, wherein he continued for about three Years and a half, and then was Crucified; after he was Betrayed by *Judas*, denyed by *Peter*, and Sentenced to Death by *Pontius Pilate*, falsly Accused, and cruelly Mocked by the *Jews*; all which, according to *W. P.* are so many *Facile representations of what is to be accomplished in Men.* And I have heard, since the difference betwixt the Quakers and me began, *about Preaching Christ without*, some of their Preachers in their Publick Meetings, Preach a great deal of the History of Christ's Birth, Persecution by *Herod* and the *Jews*, Betrayed by *Judas*, denyed by *Peter*, Sentenced to Death by *Pilate*, and made it all an Allegory of what was to be witnessed within, with an *Exhortation to Friends to wait to have it all fulfilled and witnessed within them:* And particularly I heard *Jacob Talner*, the *Dutch-man* above-mention'd, Preach at a Publick Meeting in *Philadelphia* [about the time our differences began there about Christ] *That Christ must be first Born in us, and after that must be Crucified in us*, &c. On which I asked some of their Preachers, *Were it not better, after Christ is Born in Men* (using their Phrase) *that Men would not Crucifie him in them, but rather that he might live in them? For who can Crucifie Christ in Men, but they themselves* (on supposition that he can be Crucified?) For the Devil cannot do it by himself without Men's consent and concurrence, and being the main Actors: But *G. F.* whom *J. Wyeth* calls the Apostle in this Age, hath resolved this Question; but whether effectually so as either consistent with Scripture or true and right Reason, to which no true Revelation can contradict, I leave to the intelligent Christian to judge, in a Treatise of his, call'd, *Several Papers given forth for the spreading of Truth*, one of them bearing this Title, *Concerning Christ's Flesh which was Offered*, p. 54. " Christ the Lamb slain " from the Foundation of the World, when it began its Foundation, then " the Lamb was slain, then the World was set up in Man's Heart, that " he did not see the beginning nor the ending of the Works of God; " —— Then came their Understandings to be darken'd, and Christ AC- " CORDING TO THE FLESH CRUCIFIED, the Lamb Slain, that " FLESH of his, which is a Mystery; and when the *Jews* did transgress " the Law of God, the Prophets told them, they OPPRESSED the Seed, " as a Cart with Sheaves. [*Note*, the word Oppressed, tho' *G. W.* is so " impudent in his *Judgment Fixed*, p. 322. as to deny that the Seed is " Christ and God that is Oppressed] —— That they may come to a *thing* " that's *lower* and *under*, and *higher* and *over all*, and before all that is the " Righteousness it self; so *in this lies the Belief*, so then *in the Life* and in the " SUBSTANCE, and in the end of all Types, so through this Flesh he " doth reconcile, and by the offering up his Body, his Flesh, that which " hath been Slain from the Foundation of the World, and yet never cor- " rupted: —— And this Flesh is a Mystery; and in this Flesh is the " Belief that takes away the Sin, that never corrupted, that is the Offering " for Sin, and the Blood of this Flesh cleanseth from Sin; so through this Of- " fering is the Reconciliation, through the Offering of his Flesh that never " corrupted, but takes away Corruptions, and his Blood *Cleanseth from Cor-*

" *ruptions*,

" *ruptions*, THE LIFE READ. See the Quotation more at large in my Third Narrative, *p.* 24, 25. And it is obſervable that he ſaith with reſpect to *Chriſt* being thus inwardly Crucified, *for as he was God he did not die*, but whether he did ſuffer as he was God, he doth not here determine, tho' *G. W.* hath determined it, as above-quoted, *That Chriſt as God doth ſuffer in Men by their Sins.*

Note, Whereas many of the Quakers, particularly *G. W.* doth argue againſt Chriſt without us being the object of Faith; *Can* (ſaith he) *the object of Faith be divided from the Faith?* Which Argument has no more force, than if he ſhould argue, The Sun cannot be the object or Foundation of his Sight, becauſe it is without him, and at a great diſtance from him, but his Sight is within him. And he hath of late been heard, ſeveral times to preach in the Quakers Meetings, that *Chriſt without us* cannot be the *object* of our Faith; doth not *G. F.* here propoſe an object of our Faith without us? and ſuch an object, as is very difficult, if not impoſſible, to apprehend, to wit, the Fleſh of Chriſt, which was Crucified when *Adam* ſinned, and that Blood of his that was then ſhed or offered together with the Fleſh, —— And *in this Fleſh is the Belief* (ſaith he) *that takes away the Sin.* But poſſibly *G. W.* or ſome other will ſay, the Fleſh of Chriſt that was Crucified in *Adam*, when he ſinned, is conveyed or tranſmitted from him into us. If any of them will adventure to ſay ſo, it will occaſion ſuch Intricacies and Niceties, that the Quakers pretended plainneſs doth not ſuit with; for *G. W.* in his Book, call'd, *The Divine Light of Chriſt in Man*, p. 13. giveth this deſcription of the People call'd Quakers, *That they are not only eſteemed an illiterate People, but are a plain, ſimple, innocent People, who moſt affect plain Scripture-Language, without any School-gloſſes or nice diſtinctions, to deck, adorn, or illuſtrate their Chriſtian Profeſſion of Chriſt, or his Divine Light in Men. And many thouſands may not underſtand the terms*, Vehiculum Dei, Intermediate Being, nor is *Jeſus Chriſt, preached among us under thoſe terms, but in Scripture terms.* [The terms *Vehiculum Dei* had been uſed by *R. Barclay*, in his *Apology*, p. 83. and *Intermediate Being* by me, in ſome of my former Writings *concerning the Seed of God*, or principle of God's Grace in Men; but which we carried not to that height, nor had that ſenſe of it, to be the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt *that is the Offering for Sin*, and makes the Atonement by way of Expiation to take away the guilt of Sin.] But is not *G. W.*'s Fallacy very plain in this Caſe? Did not *G. F.* Preach Chriſt as he Writ and Printed concerning him; and what though *G. F.* and none of the Quakers ever uſed the word VEHICULUM DEI, or INTERMEDIATE BEING before *R. B.* and *G. K.* uſed them, which they chiefly uſed to help the Quakers out of the Mire, and render (if poſſible) the Quakers Notions about the Seed within, intelligible, but they carrying it far beyond, whatever *R. B.* or I ever thought of, particularly *G. F.* and *G. W.* as I have found by my late more exact ſearch into their Books, than ever formerly I made; I find it not only difficult but impoſſible to reconcile them, either with Scripture or right and true Reaſon, and therefore I diſown them, and whatever I have formerly Writ, that ſeemed in the leaſt to juſtifie ſuch Notions as I have found in the Quakers Writings, particularly

Light and Life, p. 45.

larly in the Writings of *G. F.* and *G. W.* let them be as void and null, as if they had never been Writ. [See my late Book of Retractations.] Altho', as I have already said, I carried them not so far, so much as in my thoughts, and I think no more did *R. B.* as they have done.

Now since *G. W.* professeth that the Quakers are such a plain simple People, who most affect plain Scripture Language, how is it that both G. W. himself, and G. F. the chief Leaders and Teachers among them have gone so far from Scripture Language about *Christ within*, that they have run into most wild and extravagant Notions, that they sucked in from Familists and Ranters about Christ within? Where do they find such Scripture Language, That *Christ, according to the Flesh, was crucified when* Adam *sinned, and his Blood then shed*, and that that *Flesh*, then crucified, was the *Offering* for *Sin*, and the *Blood* of that Flesh cleanseth away Sin, and that *the Belief or Faith is in that Offering, the Flesh that was then Crucified*: And where doth G. W. find his wild Notion of a *Blood of Christ within Men*, that cleanseth from Sin, by way of Sacrifice and Atonement; or of any other *Blood* of Christ, than the *Blood* of his *Humanity*; for tho' that place of Scripture, *Acts* 20. 28. calls the Blood of Christ, wherewith he purchased his Church, *the Blood of God*, yet it doth not say, it was a *Blood within Men*, or the Blood of the *Godhead*, and not of *Christ's Humanity*; it is call'd the *Blood* of God, because Christ, whose Blood it was, was not a meer Man, but both God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus was God, tho' his *Godhead* was not his *Manhood*.

But as to this *Conveyance* of Christ's Flesh, conveyed or transmitted from *Adam* into his Posterity, since his Fall, what Scripture Language is this? If any of them will dare so to affirm, give us Chapter and Verse for any such Doctrine or Terms? But yet further to discover the grosness of this wild Notion: Is this Flesh of Christ conveyed or transmitted into his Posterity, *Crucified* or *Alive*? If they say *Crucified*, it is scarcely intelligible, how *dead* or *crucified* Flesh, however so Spiritual, can be *conveyed* or *transmitted* from *Adam* into us; or how any *crucified Seed* or *Principle* can be so conveyed; and seeing that as we are all descended of *Noah*, and he was descended of *Seth*, and *Seth* was descended of *Adam*, by humane Generation, long after *Adam*'s Fall, *and the Seed of the Woman* was promised to him, it is most probable, That if there was any *crucified* Flesh, or *Body of Christ* in *Adam* when he Fell, that *crucified Body, Seed or Principle, was quickened and raised in him, some time before he begot* Seth, *and it will therefore follow rather, that such a Body, Seed or Principle, if conveyed or transmitted from* Adam *into his Posterity, is conveyed alive and not dead.* Beside, how can it be conveyed by natural Generation? Indeed, many of the Quakers deny any conveyance of *Original Sin*, by natural Generation, as the *Pelagians* denyed of old, because they cannot comprehend with their Reason, how such a conveyance can be; to be sure it is altogether remote from all rational Comprehension, as well as from Scripture, that such a *Noble Principle*, as *the Seed of God*, should come by natural Generation, and so come to all Men, even the Children of Heathens, as well as the Children of Believers, as the Quakers commonly Teach; yea, *G. F.* saith, *G. M.* p. 209. *Every Man AT*

HIS COMING INTO THE WORLD hath a Light from Christ, him by whom the World was made, which is more than Conscience. But if every Man has that Light at his coming into the World, then Heathen Infants have it; and seeing they have it from Christ, whether they have it Immediately conveyed, or Mediately, by natural Generation, through their Parents, as they have their natural Flesh? If Immediately from Christ, it is more rational to suppose it is not crucified nor killed at its first reception: Beside, how can it be a slain or dead Thing in them, when it *convinceth them of the sins of Lying, Theift, and the like, and speaketh to them in their Hearts and Consciences, and teacheth them their whole duty to God and Man, if they will obey it; yea, an entire Systeme of Orthodox Divinity*; If *J. Wyeth* can be believed, how can it do all this, and be a dead or crucified thing in them?

These are but some of the inexplicable and unintelligible Difficulties, beside many more that might be mentioned, which the *wild Notions* and Phrases of *G. F.* and *G. W.* especially, as far from Scripture Language, as Darkness is from Light, have led them into, and many others whom they have bewildred with them, notwithstanding G. W.'s fallacious pretences of his Brethren and Himself, *being an innocent, plain, simple People, that most affect Scripture Language*, when, indeed, no Society call'd Christians (nay not the Church of *Rome*) have so much deviated from Scripture Language, as well as Scripture Doctrine and Sense, as they have done.

But let none from this infer, that I do not own the Doctrine and Faith of *Christ within*, and of his Divine Teachings, Inspirations and Illuminations, for that I do withal my Heart, as truly as ever I did, and, I hope, rather better; only I deny the Quakers wild, extravagant and blasphemous Notions of Christ within, and particularly of *G. F.* and *G. W.* above-mention'd, who affirm that Christ is Crucified in all unregenerate Persons, and that the Flesh of this crucified Christ in them is the Offering for Sin, and the Belief is to be in this Flesh, and the Blood of this Flesh cleanseth from all Sin: Which Flesh was crucified in *Adam*, when he Fell; but how from *Adam* it came into them, either crucified or alive, is not intelligible, and therefore no proper object of Faith; but if they say it is alive in all Men, at its first reception, or at their first coming into the World, then all Men are Born Sanctified and Spiritually Regenerated, Heathens as well as Christians; for the great difference that the Quakers give betwixt Regenerated and Unregenerated Persons, lies in this, That the Seed Christ is alive in the Regenerated, but crucified and dead in the Unregenerated.

But yet again, to shew how much *G. W.* acts the Sophister in his late pretences to own, the Merit of the Blood of Christ that was outwardly shed, which yet he hath so plainly denied in his *Light and Life*, and mightily opposed it, *That the shedding of that Blood upon the Cross was the meritorious cause of Man's Justification*, in p. 8. Of *Light and Life* he blames *W. B. For laying a twofold stress upon that Blood*, 1. *Merit to Salvation*, 2. *Work to Sanctification*, *and* infers against *W. B*'s twofold assertion, *That in his so doing, he hath set it* (viz that Blood) *up above God, for God could not save he saith*, and *yet is not in being, gross absurdity saith* G. W. Here the force of *G. W.*'s Sophistical Argument

Argument againſt the Merit of Chriſt's Blood, is very apparent, To ſay that Blood is the Meritorious cauſe of our Salvation is to ſet it up above God, which is a moſt abſurd conſequence, and his proof of his conſequence he grounds upon an abſolute forgery whereby he manifeſtly wrongs his Opponent *W. B.* in his alledging on him, that he ſaid, *God could not ſave*, whereas, *W. B.* did not ſay, God could not ſave, *But that Chriſt as he was God, without being Man, he could not ſave Man.* See *W. B.*'s *Capital Principles*, p. 35, 36. which is a moſt Orthodox Doctrine, rightly underſtood, *viz.* Seeing God hath appointed to ſave Man after that manner. *G. VV.*'s further oppoſition to the Blood of Chriſt as outwardly ſhed, being the Meritorious cauſe of Man's Juſtification, is evident from his words *Light and Life*, p. 61. *But mark how one while* W. B. *makes that Blood, and the ſhedding of it, his Juſtifier and Redeemer*, &c. *VVhich he has confeſſed is not in being. Another while People muſt ſeek their Saviour above the Clouds and Firmament contrary to the righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 10. 6. *Another while they muſt look to* Jeruſalem *for Juſtification, and to the Blood that was there ſhed, contrary to* Deut. 30. 13, 14. And Rom. 10. *And if Men ſhould look to* Jeruſalem *for that Blood, it is not there to be found, for it is not in being, ſays* W. B.

The Seven *Colcheſter* Quakers, in their Printed Paper, called, *Some Account, above mentioned*, p. 16. pretended to anſwer this paſſage, by producing ſome words of *G. VV.* in his *Light and Life*, which they think will juſtifie him, but all in vain, unleſs to detect his and their dull Sophiſtry. *VV. B.* having ſaid, *The ſhedding of the Blood upon the Croſs, that was let out by Virtue of the Spear, being thruſt into his ſide, to be Meritorious, or the Meritorious cauſe of Man's Juſtification.* To this *G. W.* Anſwereth, *The ſhedding of that Blood, let out by the Spear, was an act of a wicked Man; and the Spear, an Inſtrument of cruelty, which to lay the Meritorious cauſe or ſtreſs of Juſtication upon, is falſe Doctrine, for there is a great difference between Chriſt's offering up himſelf by the eternal Spirit, a Lamb without Spot to God, and the acts of wicked Men inflicted upon him, as it is ſaid, by wicked Hands they put him to Death.* And they conclude ſaying, *But the making the very act of ſhedding his Blood by the Spear, to be the Meritorious cauſe of Man's Juſtification, we therefore ask them, if they really believe the ſame.* Here, *Note*, Both *G. W.*'s and the Seven *Colcheſter* Quakers fallacy, thereby to cover *G. W.*'s vile Hereſie. He moſt unjuſtly chargeth it upon *W. B.* his Opponent, that he laid the *Meritorious cauſe or ſtreſs* of Juſtification, upon the *Act of* the wicked Man, that thruſt the Spear into our Saviour's Side, but this is a piece of groſs forgery in *G. W.* ſo to charge *W. B.* and miſtate the Controverſie, between *W. B.* and him; nothing but deceit it ſelf could invent ſuch a forgery in *G. W.* as this, to charge it on *W. B.* as if he had either ſaid or thought that the *Meritorious cauſe* of Man's Juſtification, was laid by him, upon the *Act of* the Soldier, that thruſt the Spear into our Saviour's Side; for neither did he ſay it, nor can it be gathered from his Words, by the leaſt ſhadow of any juſt Conſequence, his Words being thus, as *G. W.* cites them, *The ſhedding of the Blood upon the Croſs that was let out, by the Virtue of the Spear being thruſt into his Side, was the Meritorious cauſe of Man's Juſtification.* See *Light and Life*, p. 64. The ſhedding of the Blood, *&c.* is the true Engliſh of

of the Latin Words *Effusio Sanguinis*, which being *A Noun Verbal*, hath a Paſſive as well as Active ſignification, and that *W. B.* meant it, in the Paſſive ſignification [and not in the Active as with reſpect to the Soldiers Act] is evident, from the Words both of *Jer.* ~~*Ives*~~, and alſo of *W. B.* quoted by *G. W. Light and Life*, p. 64. he quotes *Jer. Ives*, ſaying, My Brother *Burnet* meant *Chriſt's Paſſion*, and not *the Act of wicked Men*. And again, *G. W.* quotes *W. B.* ſaying, Yes Brother, it is proper to ſay, It was Chriſt's Act to ſhed his Blood. His meaning is obvious, to any impartial Reader, that it was Chriſt's Act, freely to give his Blood to be ſhed for the remiſſion of our Sins, as he ſaid himſelf, no Man taketh my Life from me, I lay down my Life, and I take it up again. Without all doubt, though Chriſt was not Active to Kill himſelf, by any Bodily Act of violence, that he did to himſelf, yet his giving up his Blood to be ſhed, and his Life to be taken away, was a moſt noble act of his Soul and Will; who by a moſt noble act of Obedience and Reſignation to the Will of God, for the Salvation of Men, gave up his Blood to be ſhed; for that the ſhedding of Chriſt's Blood was neceſſary for remiſſion of Men's Sins, and their Juſtification before God, is clear from his own words, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood ſhed for the remiſſion of the Sins of many*; and as the Scripture ſaith, *Without ſhedding of Blood is no remiſſion*; ſo that, had not Chriſt's Blood been ſhed, Men's Sins could not be forgiven; and yet what but deceit it ſelf can infer from this, That the merit or ſtreſs of remiſſion of Sin or Juſtification, is laid upon the act of the wicked Soldier, that thruſt his Spear into our Saviour's Side.

Note again, Seeing *G. W.* hath impoſed ſuch a Forgery upon *W. B.* without any juſt ground, as if he had placed, the Merit of Men's Juſtification, upon the act of the wicked Man that thruſt the Spear into our Saviour's Side: By the like forgery, he may charge *the Church of England*, with the ſame abſurdity, (though moſt unjuſtly) for in the *Prayer* immediately before *Baptiſm*, [in the Office of Baptiſm for thoſe of Riper Years] ſhe thus Prays, *Almighty everliving God, whoſe moſt dearly beloved Son, Jeſus Chriſt for the forgiveneſs of our Sins, DID SHED OUT of his moſt precious Side, both Water and Blood, and gave Commandment*, &c. Here we ſee it's ſaid, that Chriſt *SHED OUT* of his moſt precious Side, both Water and Blood. Can therefore *G. W.* from thence infer, that the *Church* of *England* believeth, that ſhe layeth the Merit of remiſſion of Sin, and Juſtification upon the act of the Soldier, or that Chriſt by any act of Violence killed himſelf, or commanded others to do it; and if no juſt conſequence, as this, can be gathered out of the *Church* of *England*'s Words, nor can they from the Words of *W. B.* that are of the ſame importance.

But it's no wonder that *G. W.* will have the ſhedding of that Blood which came out of Chriſt's Side, when it was pierced, to be only the Soldiers act, when *T. Elwood* in his *Truth Defended*, p. 99. denyeth the Blood that came out of Chriſt's Side, and its ſhedding after he was Dead, to have been to compleat the Offering, for this he ſaith, and again repeats the ſame Words and juſtifies them in his pretended Anſwer to my firſt Narrrative, p. 220, 221. *This offering up himſelf, (and giving himſelf a ranſom for all) included all his*

his ſufferings both inward and outward, and made it a compleat and perfect Sacrifice, in which his Blood was comprehended and concerned as well as his Fleſh, before his Side was pierced by the Spear, for he had pronounced that great Word, Conſummatum eſt, it is finiſhed, had bowed his Head, and given up the Ghoſt before his Side was pierced with the Spear. This is not only contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as above quoted in the Office of Baptiſm, but of all Orthodox Chriſtians throughout the World, who teach according to Scripture, That the *Water and Blood* that came out of our Lord's Side, after his Death, was a *ſpecial part* of the Offering as well as his Death; and the wounds in his Hands and Feet and the Blood that came out of them, before his Death; which groſs Error of *T. Elwood*, is the Error of the Second Days meeting at *London*, who approved his Book, and of *G. W.* who profeſſeth the ſame Faith with them, is deſervedly cenſured and refuted, in *Satan diſrob'd*, p. 47. *His Body pierced and his Blood ſhed after his Death, were truly and properly a part of the Sacrifice, as much as what he ſuffered before he expired. As the legal Sacrifice was not compleated by the Death of the Beaſt, but by the Burning of it, and offering the Blood afterwards, that was ſhed; and thoſe who reject that Blood do mutilate his Sacrifice, and render it ineffectual to themſelves.*

Note, again, How neither *G. W.* nor the *Colcheſter* Quakers, in their *Some Account, &c.* give any anſwer, to what was objected againſt him, out of his *Light and Life*, p. 61. Though quoted by them, p. 15. Where he poſitively aſſerts, That *to ſeek our Saviour above the Clouds and Firmament* [i. e. to pray to him as he is in Heaven, without us, above the Clouds and Firmament] *is contrary to the Righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 10. 6. *And to look to the Blood that was ſhed at* Jeruſalem, *for Juſtification, is contrary to* Deut. 30. 13, 14. and *Rom.* 10. which ſeeking or looking to Chriſt, and his Blood, as is above-quoted and proved, was not by any outward or bodily act, but by Faith, and yet even ſuch ſeeking or looking is denyed, and oppoſed by *G. W.* and his *Colcheſter* Quaker Brethren.

But whereas *G. W.* doth argue ſo much and ſo frequently againſt that Blood that was outwardly ſhed by the Spear, its being the meritorious Cauſe of Juſtification, becauſe that Blood is not to be found at *Jeruſalem*, for it's not in being ſays *W. B.* as *G. W.* quotes him. Suppoſe *W. B.* had poſitively ſaid [as if they had been his words originally] *That Blood is not in being*; yet he was far from inferring thence, that we are not juſtified by that Blood; this was *G. W.*'s conſequence, and not *W. B.*'s for *W. B.* did ſtrongly aſſert, that Men are juſtified by the Blood that was then ſhed, tho' it was not now in being, but (ſaid he) the Efficacy of it is ſtill in being; but *G. W.* did draw a quite contradictory Concluſion, to that of *W. B.* as thus, That Blood that was ſhed by the Spear, is not in being, ſaith *W. B.* therefore *G. W.* concludes, Men are not juſtified by it; which Argument of *G. W.*'s has equal force againſt Chriſt's Death, and Bodily pains, as well as his Souls Dolours and Griefs, they are not now in being, therefore Men are not juſtified by them. And his Argument has the like force againſt Men's being juſtified, or having their Sins pardoned, by the Merit of Chriſt's Blood, before Chriſt came in the Fleſh; for example, *David* had not the

remiſſion

remiſſion of his Sins by the Merit of Chriſt's Blood, becauſe by *G.* W.'s Logick, in *David*'s time, the Blood was not in being: But as I ſhewed in the Meeting the Words [that Blood is not in being] were not originally W *B*'s, but ſome Quakers Words, or ſome other that held the like falſe notions with them, which W. *B.* calls a Cavillation. *Capital Principles* p. 40. *Of late, ſaith he, I have frequently met with a Query by way of Cavillation, Which is, whether that Blood ſpilt upon the Croſs run not on the ground*, &c. *If ſo, how then can Man be juſtified by that which is not in being?* Thus we ſee, W. *B.* cenſures the conſequence of that Argument to be invalid, but *G.* W. again, and again, I know not how frequently, makes uſe of it, and thinks the Concluſion to be good; and I ſaid, in the Meeting, had *G.* W. been preſent, I would have asked him, what was his Anſwer to that Queſtion, Is the Blood that was ſhed on the Croſs now in being? [If he happen to reply to this 4th Narative, I deſire him to give a poſitive anſwer to it, ſeeing he makes it the Foundation of his Concluſion, that Men are not juſtified by the Merit of that Blood, becauſe that Blood is not in being] but ſeeing I had not *G.* W. there, I asked *Dan. Philip* [who was preſent, and ſat near where I ſtood, and is one of the Quakers in the Unity] whither that Blood was in being, He replied he knew not whither I meant the Blood, that was without Chriſt's Body, or within it; I told him, the Blood that went out of his Body, whether that Blood was in being? but he gave no reply. I asked him again, whether he believed that the Blood that was outwardly ſhed, was Meritorious to Juſtification, and that true Believers were juſtified by it, he ſaid, he knew not what I meant by the Word *Merit, or Meritorious*; I told him, it was a ſhame for him, to pretend to be ſo Ignorant of the ſignification of the Word, that an ordinary School Boy did know, ſeeing he was a Scholar, and did not long ago, commence Dr. of Phyſick at *Leiden*, and had there a Latin Oration. However, I gave him the ſignification of it, that *Merit* ſignified that it was of that Worth and Value by way of Atonement and Expiation to make ſatisfaction to God, for the guilt of our Sins. He alſo pretended he knew not what I meant by the Word *Atonement*, I told him, it ſignified reconciling and bringing Men into favour with God. I asked, again, were Believers juſtified by the Merit of the Blood, that was outwardly ſhed, he anſwered it was a part of the Offering, but I asked were Believers juſtified by it, He ſaid, that Blood will juſtifie none, that are not Sanctified; I replied, that was not the queſtion, nor is it any part of the Controverſie; I further asked him, what did he mean by the Offering whether Chriſt only as without us, or as within us, or both without and within, and both by Chriſt's Blood without us, as outwardly ſhed, and by the Blood of his God-Head as inwardly ſhed in Men, as *G.W.* will have it now at laſt; but to this he gave no poſitive anſwer; and though in all his anſwers he gave, on this or other heads, he greatly foiled himſelf: He is (as I am informed) ſo confident, that he tells in private, how he foiled me. But ſeeing neither he, nor any of the Quakers there preſent, offered any anſwer to that queſtion; Is that Blood of Chriſt that was outwardly ſhed in being? I told them, I believed the ſubſtance of it was ſtill in being, for not the leaſt atome of any Bodily ſubſtance was ever an-

annihilated; but to enquire, where that Blood now was, or whether Christ did take it back again into his Body, [which no doubt he was able to do, having all power, was a curious and unnecessary question, to be resolved,] And here I brought a saying of *B. Burnet* (whose Name I mentioned with due respect) to the same effect in his Exposition on the xxxix Articles of the Church of *England*, and also, sometime afterwards at the same Meeting, I quoted him, in the same Book, to shew my Agreement with him [as I do with all sound Christian Teachers] that our Lord has the same Body, in substance, he had on Earth, and that his Body is not changed in substance, but in the different *Contexture* of parts.

And on this Head also I queried *Dan. Philips*, Whither Christ's Body was the same in Substance, now in Heaven, that it was on Earth; and whether it was, when on Earth, a terrestrial Body; he said, He did not know what I meant by Substance. I told him, the same that others meant, who had any true skill in Natural Philosophy, and it was a shame to a Dr. of Physick, to profess his being ignorant to define a Substance; however I told him, that a Substance (understanding a created Substance) was a Being or Thing that did only depend on God Almighty, the first Cause, and was the subject of certain Accidents that did depend on it, and could not be without it. He asked whether a Substance could be without Accidents? I answer'd him, it could be without Accidents of this or that kind, and could be wonderfully changed in Accidents, and yet remain the same Substance. I asked him again, Was our Lord's Body earthly, when it was on earth? He answered, it was like ours in all things, Sin excepted. I again asked, but was it earthly, when on earth? Here he demurred, and would not give a positive Answer; a Minister that stood by, said, by his confessing it was like ours, he has confessed it was an earthly Body; I said, to them that are sound in the Faith it is so, but not to the Quakers; for they will not allow, that an earthly Body, and an heavenly Body, can be the same Body in Substance, or that a natural Body, and a spiritual Body, are the same in Substance; for which I quoted *G. W.'s Light and Life*, p. 69. *Who calls him a very blind and ignorant Man that will affirm, That Bodies Celestial and Terrestrial, differ not in Substance*; whereby he has proved himself to be both blind and ignorant, by his ignorant Assertion. And I told the Auditory, how the Quakers ignorance and false Notions of Philosophy, destroy'd their Faith, and hindred them to believe that necessary and fundamental Article of the Christian Faith, That Christ's Body that he had on Earth, is the same in Substance it was in Heaven; and tho' when on Earth, it was earthly, and is heavenly now, yet the change was not in Substance but in Accidents; for if it be not the same in Substance, it is in no respect the same; for, take away the Substance and no Accidents can remain of any thing. And by the like false Philosophy, both *G. W.* and *W. P.* have argued against the Resurrection-Bodies of the Saints, that they shall not be the same in Substance with the Natural Bodies they had on Earth. And I further shewed, that *Muggleton* said, Christ's Body was like ours, and yet would not own it was the same Substance with ours; for, he held that Christ's Body that hung on the Cross,

and was laid in the Sepulcher, was the Godhead; yea, was God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

Nor is *G. W.* and his ſeven *Colcheſter* Brethren, leſs fallacious, in his and their Defence of *Solomon Eccles*'s Blaſphemous ſaying, 'That the Blood 'of Chriſt that was forced out of him, by the Soldier after he was dead, 'was no more than the Blood of another Saint. In their *Some Account*, they quote *G. W.*'s *Antidote*, for his defence, p. 223, 224, 225. 1. He ſaith, he ſhewed a diſlike of *S. E.*'s Expreſſions before-cited, but how? in that he did not allow them as an Article of their Faith. But nor did he cenſure them as contrary to their Faith, which he ought to have done, and would have done, had he been in the true Faith. And that his diſlike did not proceed from any deteſtation of the Error, is very apparent, that he ſaid in his defence of *S. E. That S. E. did highly ſpeak in eſteem of the Blood of Chriſt, and New Covenant, as more excellent and living, and holy and precious, than is able to be utter'd*, &c. *which* (G. W. ſaith) *might have ſatisfied any ſpiritual or unbyaſs'd Mind*; therefore it ſeems it ſatisfy'd *G. W.* But the deceit of *G. W.* lyeth in this, That the Blood which *S. E.* did ſo highly eſteem, was not that Blood, that was let out of his Side, after Chriſt was dead, as *S. E.* plainly confeſſed in his Letter to *R. Porter*, but another kind of Blood, that is, the Blood not of the Humanity, but of the Godhead; the Blood of the New Covenant, which is Inward and Spiritual, ſaith *G. W.* 2. He ſaith, he ſhewed in part his eſtimation of the Blood and whole Sacrifice or Offering of Chriſt, both in reſpect to the bleſſed Teſtimony, Value and Efficacy thereof, more than that of any other Saint or Saints. But I find no ſuch Teſtimony in all that Book, to any Value or Efficacy of it, by way of Merit, as it was ſhed for the remiſſion of Sins: For it is a great part of his work throughout his whole Book, *Light and Life*, to contend againſt the Merit and Value or Efficacy of it, for Men's Juſtification and Salvation, as is largely above-proved out of many Quotations in that very Book, and can be further proved. Yea, he would not ſo much as allow it to be concerned in any part or reſpect, as the meritorious Cauſe of Men's Juſtification, *Light and Life*, p. 56. For 'We are not (ſaith he) to ſuppoſe two 'kinds of Saviours and Sanctifiers, that is both a Natural which is not in be-'ing, as is ſaid of the Blood that was ſhed) and the Spirit which ſtill liv-'eth. Thus he wholly excludes the outward Blood, which he calls Natural, and placeth all upon the Spirit, arguing moſt weakly and impertinently, That to ſay, *we are ſaved by the Blood of Chriſt that was outwardly ſhed* [as the meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification, and Sanctification, and Salvation] *and by the Spirit of Chriſt*, [as the internal Agent and Efficient, that applyeth to us the Merit and Efficacy of that Blood that was outwardly ſhed] *is to infer two kinds of Saviours and Sanctifiers*; he might by as good an Argument infer, That a Medicine, and he that applyeth the Medicine to the Patient, are two Doctors of Phyſick, as to argue that Juſtification or Sanctification by the Blood of Chriſt, and by the Spirit of Chriſt, *is to ſuppoſe two Saviours*. But how will *G. W.* anſwer his own Argument, who of late, but without any Retractation of his former Error, doth own, Redemption, both by the natural Blood outwardly, and by the Spirit inwardly,

wardly, *Antidote* p. 232, 233, 234. And it ſtill remains as a vile Error juſtly charged on *G. W.* which he hath never to this day fairly anſwer'd, nor any for him, that in *Light and Life*, p. 59. he blames *W. K.* for ſaying, *That Blood that Chriſt ſhed in order to the effecting the Salvation of Man, muſt needs be viſible and material Blood*; in oppoſition to which, he plainly denies, *That the material Blood of the Sacrifices was a Type of the material Blood of Chriſt*; *for that were to ſay* (ſaith he) *that material Blood was a Type of that which was material, this to give the Subſtance no Pre-eminence above the Type*; which clearly proveth, that *G. W.* held that the material Blood of Chriſt was not the Subſtance ſignified by the Blood of the Sacrifices that were offer'd under the Law, but a Type or Figure of ſome inward thing, to wit, their ſpiritual Blood within, which they call the Life and the Light. 3. But after all, tho' *G. W.* would ſeem, at laſt, to be full and plain, in his paſſing cenſure on *S. E.*'s words, he remains ſtill Fallacious and Sophiſtical, as much as formerly; *I diſſawn* (ſaith he) *his ſaid Compariſon, of the Blood of Chriſt with that of another Saint, and believe he was not in the Counſel or Wiſdom of God therein.*

Here he nothing blames the matter of his Words, but ſaith, *he was not in the Counſel or Wiſdom of God therein*; that is to ſay, He was not wiſe nor well adviſed, to diſcloſe that great Secret or Myſtery among the Quakers, ſo as to let the World know it, that the Quakers held as a Principle among them, That that Blood was no more [by way of Merit] than that of an ordinary Saint; for in effect *G. W.* himſelf, as to all the real worth of it, above that of other Saints, by way of real Merit for Men's Juſtification, or real neceſſity to Salvation, hath plainly excluded it, not only by his many impertinent and nonſenſical Arguings and Quibblings againſt it, as above-quoted, but by his plainly aſſerting in his *Antidote*, p. 28. *That the Quakers are offended with* G. K. for ſaying, *the Light within is not ſufficient to Salvation, or not ſufficient without ſomething elſe*; the which Propoſition, ſeeing he blames as falſe, he muſt hold the contradictory to be true, *That the Light within is ſufficient to Salvation without any thing elſe*; yea, *G. W.* hath granted in his *Antidote*, p. 28. That Chriſt, as outwardly conſidered, is that ſomething elſe, which *G. K.* meant. This is an evident proof, beſide many others above-given, That it is *G. W.*'s and his Brethren's Principle, That the Blood of Chriſt that was outwardly ſhed on the Croſs, is not a meritorious Cauſe of our Salvation; nay, not ſo much as in part; and that Faith in that Blood is not neceſſary for our Juſtification, expreſly contrary to Scripture, *Rom.* 3. 25.

Hence it is, that neither in their Books, nor Preachings, is any thing generally of this Doctrine Preached, That Chriſt, *God-Man*, as without us, as he Died for us, *&c.* is the object and foundation of our Faith, for remiſſion of Sin, and for our Juſtification, and eternal Salvation; but there is much to be both read in their Books, and heard in their daily Preachings, againſt the neceſſity of any ſuch Faith. The fartheſt that they go at this day, is to Preach a little of him Hiſtorically, and as an Example; but to Preach him as without us, in the true nature of Man, to be the great Object of our Faith, Love and Adoration, they think *is hurtful*, as above-

proved; yea, W. *Smith* in his *Primmer* gives it as a mark of distinction, whereby to know, true Ministers from false, *They that are false, Preach Christ without, and bid People believe in him, as he is in Heaven above.*

Jos. Wyeth's excuse of this, in his *Switch*, p. 220. is extreamly fallacious; he thinks he may supply the defect in *W. Smith*'s Words by an *Ellipsis*, telling us, *The Church hath given abundant encouragement to supply Elliptick defects by her example and practise in the holy Scriptures, and what is so familiarly done with holy Writ, surely we may do with our Friends Books.* But to detect this fallacy, what Elliptical defects the Church has supplied in some places of the holy Scripture, she had ground so to do from other places of Scripture more full, that taught her to make that supply; but the case is far otherwise here, it being so far from being the Quakers way generally to preach Faith in Christ without Men, for Salvation that they oppose it, and call them Reprobates, who profess any such Faith; and this their great Apostle *G. F.* has taught them by his Example so to do, in his *G. M.* p. 248. he saith to *C. Wade*, *The Devil was in thee, and thou saith thou art saved by Christ without thee, and so hath recorded thy self to be a Reprobate, and ignorant of the Mystery of Christ within thee, for without that, thou dost not know Salvation.* And yet this same *C. Wade*, hath fully owned the *Mystery of Christ within*, as above-quoted. *Jos. Wyeth*'s excuse for *G. F.*'s saying to *C. Wade*, *The Devil was in him.* He saith, Was for his stuffing his Book with Lyes, but of this he gives not one Proof, though I have given several evident Proofs, That *G. F.* did grosly bely him: To the other part of *G. F.*'s charge, *Thou art saved by Christ without thee. Jos. Wyeth* Answereth, *It doth plainly contradict the Doctrine of the Apostle.* Thus we see, what value he and all his Brethren have, (in whose Name he writes) for *Christ without us*, that he saith; it plainly contradicts the Doctrine of the Apostle, but by his so saying, he palpably bewrays his and his Brethrens *Infidelity and Heathenism*, and hath prepared *a Rod* for his *own Back* instead of a Switch for the Author of the *Snake.* To suppose that *C. Wade* meant that he was saved by Christ without him, without the inward Operation of Christ, by the holy Spirit, to Sanctifie him, is great injustice done to him, for he hath sufficiently cleared himself of that charge, as I have above-quoted him. But that Faith in Christ without us, as he Died for our Sins, *&c.* is no part of the Quakers Faith, or Systeme of Doctrine, is evident from *Jos. Wyeth*'s plain confession, as above-noted, it is none of the Systeme of Principles truly Orthodox, or Substance of the Doctrine, which the Light within has taught them, for he wholly passeth it by, p. 38. and yet tells us, he has given us the *Substance*, of what the Light within has taught them: Besides, who will consider W. *Smith*'s *Primer*, out of which the above given Quotation is taken, will find that his Words wanted no Ellipsis to explain his sense, for he gives it very fully, to be his sense, that the Light within, is the only Foundation, and that there is not another, see this more largely quoted in my Third Narrative, p. 11.

Switch, p. 205.

Proofs

Proofs out of the Quakers Books, on the following Heads, viz. Christ's Coming to Judgment: The Resurrection of the Body: The Light Within: Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Eighthly, *Concerning Christ's last Coming to Judgment.*

G. *F.* in his *G. M.* p. 9. quotes *J. Bunyan* saying, That the Place where Christ shall come to Judgment, is at the Mount of *Olives*, at the East-side of *Jerusalem*; to this he Answers, "Thou hast put him far enough off "from thee, and hast not yet judged thy self (and Christ is come to Judg-"ment) and so art one of the false Prophets, who bids People look for "him beyond the Sea, lo here, lo there; but who are come to Christ, the "Light, the Life, they need not go forth; who abide here, are sealed by "the Spirit, puts not off the good and evil Day.

Note, Waving that Question, over what place on Earth Christ shall appear at his last Coming, we see here, That *G. F.* opposeth not only to the place of his Coming, but to any outward and personal Coming yet to be, and chargeth *J. B.* to be one of the false Prophets for asserting it; and saith, *Christ is come to Judgment*, as if there were no other, for that's the true state of the Controversie, betwixt *J. B.* and him; *J. B.* did not deny that Christ was inwardly Come, to reprove and judge for Sin, but he asserted his Coming personally to Judgment without us also.

G. W. in his *Light and Life*, p. 40. 41. Disputing with *W. B.* about Christ's outward Coming in his Glorified Body, to Judge the Quick and the Dead, answereth to the several Scriptures that *W. B.* brought for Christ's outward Coming at the end of the World, and carries them all to his inward Coming already fulfilled, such as, 1 *Thess.* 4. 15, 17. and *Acts* 1. 9, 10, 11. *Acts* 2, 32, 33, 34. *Matth.* 24. 30. and Verse 26. 14. and opposeth *W. B.* in his understanding them of his outward Coming in Glory at the end of the World. ——— 'And as to that, 1 *Thess.* 4. 17. (saith *G. W.*) which *W. B.* 'brings to prove that Christ shall come in the latter end of the World, from 'Heaven, above the Clouds. Now in Ver. 15. it's said, That we which are 'alive, and remain unto the Coming of the Lord. Now I ask (saith he) if 'they did live and remain to a personal Coming of Christ in the Clouds, 'yea, or nay? Or can it be reasonably thought to be a Coming that is not 'yet, that they lived and remained unto?

Note, How *G. W.* here most weakly (but very plainly to discover his Infidelity) argues against Christ's Coming at the latter end of the World; and whereas in my First Narrative I did show, That when *Paul* said, *We which are alive, and remain to the Coming of the Lord*, he spoke by an Enallage Personæ, *We* for *They*, we which remain, *i. e.* such of our Brethren, who shall be found alive at Christ's last Coming, *&c.* To this *T. E.* Answers, in his pretended Answer to my First Narrative, p. 162. *Why might not the Apostle*

Apoſtle ſpeak in the firſt Perſon [We] *as ſuppoſing that great and extraordinary Appearance and Coming of Chriſt (the certain time of which no Man knew*, Matth. 24. 36.) *was ſo near at hand, that it might probably fall out in his Life-time*; and for this ſenſe he quotes, *Heb.* 1. 2, 9, 26. 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. 1 *Joh.* 2. 18. 1 *Cor.* 10. 11. 1 *Pet.* 4. 7. as becauſe the times after Chriſt came in the Fleſh, are called the laſt times, that therefore the Apoſtles thought, the end of the World was not far off, *i. e.* in his ſenſe, That *Paul* and the other Apoſtles, thought that Chriſt would come to Judge the Quick and the Dead before they dyed.

This groſs and abſurd ſenſe, as it is contrary to *G. W.*'s words, ſo it renders *Paul* to have ſpoke an untruth, even by Divine Inſpiration; for ſaid *Paul*, *This we ſay unto you by the word of the Lord*. *J. Wyeth* in his *Switch*, p. 297, 298. and his Brethren; their common excuſe, here and elſewhere, that theſe were but Queries, ſignifie nothing to defend them; the very import of theſe Queries, implying a poſitive denyal. See this Fallacy of *T. E.* more fully detected in *Satan Diſrob'd*, being a Reply to his pretended Anſwer to my *Firſt Narrative*.

Again, *G. W.* in *Light and Life*, p. 41. ſaith, ——— "But Three Comings of Chriſt; not only that in the Fleſh, at *Jeruſalem*, and that in the "Spirit, but alſo another Coming in the Fleſh, yet to be expected, we do "not read of, but of a Second Coming, without Sin unto Salvation, which "in the Apoſtles days was looked for: And theſe words of *Paul*, *The dead in Chriſt ſhall riſe firſt*, he expounds of an inward Death.

To this *G. W.* Anſwers very fallaciouſly, in his *Truth and Innoc.* p. 61. *But is this to deny or oppoſe Chriſt's coming to Judge the Quick and the Dead? 'Twas never ſo intended. And queſtioning ſome Men's carnal Expectations of a fleſhly coming of Chriſt, to be ſeen with their carnal Eyes; was this to deny his coming in the Glory of his Father, with his Angels, to reward every Man according to his works*, [quoting, Matth. 16. 27. Luke 9. 6.] *no ſure, for that's confeſſed and undeniable.*

Note, His and his Brethren's common evaſion to hide their Infidelity, is to quibble about the Word FLESH; as if their meaning were only to deny, That Chriſt is to Come, in a fleſhly Body, ſubject to the like Paſſions it had in his ſtate of Humiliation, when upon Earth, as *Hunger*, *Thirſt*, *Pain*, *Death*, &c. But this is no part of the Controverſie, betwixt the Quakers and their Opponents. But, why may not Glorified Fleſh be taken to ſignifie *Spiritual Fleſh*, as diſtinct from *Mortal Fleſh*, as well as *Glorified Body* ſignifies *Spiritual Body*, without any change of *Subſtance?*

But it is evident that *G. W.* not only denyed, that Chriſt would Come to Judge the World, in a Body of natural and paſſible Fleſh, but that he would not Come, in the ſame Subſtance of that Body he had on Earth, which was a mortal and paſſible Body, of the ſame Nature with ours; for he makes it moſt abſurd, That an earthly Body and an heavenly Body can be the ſame Subſtance, as above-quoted.

Now, That he denyeth that Chriſt was in Heaven in a *bodily Exiſtence*, or would come to Judgment, as the Son of *Man*, in a *bodily Exiſtence*, [to wit, having any thing of that Body which he had on Earth,] is evident from

from his *Nature of Christianity*, p. 29. *Dost thou look for Christ, as the Son of* Mary, *to appear outwardly in a bodily Existence to save thee, according to thy words*; p. 30. *If thou dost, thou may'st look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt see such an Appearance of him.*

Note, To excuse his great Infidelity, he useth a gross Fallacy in his *Truth and Innoc.* p. 61. and giving a lame Quotation of his own words, *This is true in Fact* (saith he) *for those very Eyes decay and perish.* But this was no part of the Controversie betwixt *G. W.* and his Opponent, who did not presume to say or think, *That Christ's coming to Judge the World in that bodily Existence would be before his Death*; but the thing earnestly asserted, was, *That Christ as he was now really in Heaven in a bodily Existence, at God's Right Hand, so he would come in that very bodily Existence to Judge the World*; for which *G. W.* doth evidently oppose him as above-quoted. The Phrase, *Thy Eyes will drop out before thou wilt see such an Appearance*, is equivalent to this, *Thou wilt never see such an Appearance, nor any other Man for thee*, as that common Phrase, *at the Greek Calends.* And whereas he adds: *And Christ's last Coming in Power and great Glory in his Glorious Body, accompanied with his mighty Angels, at the Resurrection, must be seen with stronger, clearer, and more celestial Eyes, than perishing Eyes.* Here he still hides his vile Error. What are these more *celestial Eyes*, seeing he will not have Christ's Coming to be without Men in a bodily Existence? For in his *Light and Life*, he quotes *Matth.* 16. 27, 28. and *Luke* 9. 26, 27. in plain opposition to Christ's *outward Coming*, saying, —— *When was that Coming to be? Is it now to be looked for outwardly; and seeing he is not to Come outwardly but inwardly*, these celestial Eyes, in his sense, must be *inward Eyes.* But then, how shall the Wicked see him? for the Scripture saith, *Every Eye shall see him, even they who have pierced him*; must they have celestial Eyes wherewith to see him? And tho' the Wicked shall not see him in the same manner that the Godly shall see him, yet certainly, according to Scripture, and the Faith of all true Christians, all that ever lived, as well as they that shall be found alive in the Body at his Coming, both good and bad, shall see him, as an object without them; yea, Christ told the Chief Priest and the *Jews*, Mat. 26. 64. *Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.* At which saying, the High Priest rent his Cloaths, and said, he had spoke Blasphemy. It seems if *G. W.* had been present, he would have given the same judgment. Doth *G. W.* think that the High Priest and those *Jews* shall see Christ with celestial Eyes, seeing, according to his Philosophy, no other Eyes but celestial Eyes can see him at his Coming?

But again, *Note*, *G. W.*'s palpable contradiction both to himself and to *T. E.* in his *Truth and Innoc.* above-quoted, p. 61. he seems to own Christ's Coming, as a thing yet to be at the end of the World, tho' in *Light and Life*, p. 41. from that very place, which he now quotes for it, *Matth.* 16. 27, 28. he did argue against it; and thus in express words doth *T. Elwood* in his pretended Answer to my First Narrative argue, *p.* 160. *That Coming* (saith he) *there spoken of by Christ*, Matth. 16. 27. *could not be meant of his Coming at the end of the World, because it was to begin in that very Age.*

And

And yet *G. W.* in his *Truth and Innoc.* contrary to his former gloſs, and *T. Elwood* alſo, would ſeem now to underſtand it of Chriſt's coming, as a thing yet to be at the end of the World, and if he do not ſo underſtand it, he moſt groſly deceives his Reader, and if he do ſo underſtand it, he palpably contradicts himſelf, as well as his Brother *T. E.* and yet he is the infallible *G. W.* ſtill, without any change. And for all *G. W.* his ſeeming now at laſt, to be drawn, to a plain confeſſion of his Faith, concerning Chriſt without us, in his, *Appendix to the Switch*, p. 544. yet he is ſtill fallacious, and lurks like a *Snake* in the Graſs. He profeſſeth to own his belief, concerning Chriſt without us, in Eight ſeveral *ſteps*, from his *Conception* and *Birth* without us, to his *Reſurrection*, and *Aſcenſion* without us, "Being ſeen (ſaith he) to aſcend without us, and a "Cloud received him out of their ſight, who beheld him aſcend; unto "whom it was ſaid by the Two Angels preſent, This ſame Jeſus which "is taken up from you into Heaven, ſhall ſo come in like manner, as "ye have ſeen him go into Heaven, *Acts* 1. 3, 9, 10, 11. And doubtleſs "when he ſo comes, and all his mighty Angels with him, it will be in "great Glory and open Triumph, and he will in that Day be greatly "glorified in his Saints, and admired in all them that believe, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7, 8, 9, 10.

Note, How he goeth no further in his confeſſion to Chriſt without us, but to his Aſcenſion, and the Cloud receiving him out of their ſight. But in the other two following ſteps of the Chriſtians Faith, fully as neceſſary as the former *Eight*, and without which the other *Eight* are of little or no ſignification, to demonſtrate a true Chriſtian, *viz.* Chriſt's being ſat down without us, at the Right Hand of God, in the true Nature of Man, conſiſting of a Created glorified Soul and Body, the ſame he had on Earth, the ſame in Subſtance, but wonderfully changed in manner and condition, and in that very glorified Nature of Man that he will come without us, to Judge the Quick and the Dead; he is altogether ſilent, and his Words ſeem rather to imply a denial of them, than any affirmation, as with reſpect either to Chriſt's being now in Heaven, without us, in that Body which roſe from the Grave, or his coming without us from Heaven in that Body to Judgment.

Again, take notice of another fallacy of *G. W.* in his anſwer to the queſtion propoſed, whether they (*i. e.* the Quakers) believe in Chriſt as without them, as without all other Men, he varieth the terms of the queſtion, from a believing in Chriſt without them, to a Hiſtorical Faith of their believing that Chriſt was Conceived without them, Born without them, Crucified without them; all which he and his Brethren may believe Hiſtorically, as they believe the Hiſtorical Relation of *Moſes*'s Birth, Death, *&c.* and yet have no Faith in Chriſt without them, as the great Saviour of Men, for remiſſion of Sin, Juſtification and Eternal Life and Salvation, as the great Object of ſaving Faith, for this he hath fiercely oppoſed in his *Light and Life*, arguing againſt W. *B.* who aſſerted Chriſt without us in Heaven, to be the Object of our Faith, for Juſtification. (Saith *G. W.*) Is the Object and Foundation of Faith divided from the Faith?

Light and Life, p. 64.

But

But what the Cloud is that received Christ out of the sight of Men, and with what Body Christ did ascend, and whether as a Person without us, Christ is to be Prayed unto, and whether he is to return as a Person without us to Judge the World; hear what *W. Bailie*, a great Author among the Quakers, saith. In his Printed *Collection*, p. 390. "——— But methinks I "hear some say (in their Reasonings and Imaginations) What Body hath "he, and where is it, seeing it is said, he is at the Right Hand of God? This "I shall Answer (saith he) with his own words, which he spake here on "Earth, *viz. No Man ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from "heaven, the Son of Man which is in heaven*; he that hath an Ear to hear "let him hear and take notice, what *Body* that was which came down "from Heaven, when *Mary* said unto the Angel, *How can this be, seeing I "know not a Man?* Thus we see he falsifies our Saviour's words, and will have no *Body* that ascended to Heaven, but what came from Heaven; whereas our Saviour, in the place quoted, mentions not the Word BODY.

Again, In his Treatise *Deep calleth unto Deep*, p. 30. he saith, —— *And so he taught them to Pray*, Our Father, *&c. not to look at his Person, and Pray to him as a Person without them, but bad them Pray to their Father which seeth in secret*, &c. Again, in his p. 26. *But, indeed, it is but a Cloud that hath received him out of the sight of the Gazers; but saith the Lord to his Children, I have blotted out your Iniquities like a thick Cloud.* ——— *And, indeed, this* [*viz.* the Cloud of their Sins] *hath hid both his Body and Face from you, for the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Lord from Heaven, comes not with outward observation, but the Kingdom is within.* And in his p. 29. *I never read in all the Scriptures* (saith he) *as I can remember, of a Third Coming of Christ, personally in his own single Person, or of a personal Reign, besides what shall be in his Saints.* And *G. W.* in his *Christ Ascended above the Clouds*, not only denyeth any personal Coming of Christ, yet to be at the end of the World, but denyeth him to have a personal Existence in Heaven, without the Saints, and chargeth it to be *Anthropomorphitism* and *Muggletonism*. And, indeed, I know not one place of Scripture, of the many that are justly brought by sound Christians to prove Christ's Coming without us, in his Glorified Body to Judge the World, at the great Day of Judgment, but they have turned altogether to his inward Coming, which, they say, they witness already fulfilled in them, and they look for no other Coming.

Ninthly, *Concerning the Resurrection of the Body that Dyeth.*

G. W. instead of answering to the Quotations brought out of his and his Brethren's Books against the Resurrection of the Body that Dyeth, has not so much as produced them, or any part of them, they are so broad-fac'd Proofs, to evidence his and his Brethren's Infidelity in that great Article of Faith, that he seems asham'd so much as to mention them. And

whereas he saith, their Arguments not being answer'd by their Opposers, he shall need say the less to them; and concludes, That he would have them so Charitable, that they would not condemn them as Blasphemers, for believing that their Resurrection-Bodies shall be Spiritual and Glorious, far excelling these natural, carnal and earthly Bodies; for else, how should the Saints Bodies be like unto Christ's Glorious Body.

Note here again, He seeks to cloak his and his Brethren's Infidelity, by perverting the true state of the Question, which is not, That the *Resurrection-Bodies* of the Saints shall not be wonderfully changed, and far excelling these natural, carnal and earthly Bodies, and made Spiritual and Glorious, like to Christ's Glorious Body, for that is acknowledged; But the true Question is, Whether the Saints Bodies, at the Resurrection, shall be so changed, that they shall not be the same in *Substance*, or *Essence* of Bodies, and consequently in no respect the same; for if the Substance be not the same, to be sure, the Accidents are not; and consequently, nothing of that Body that dyeth, either in Matter or Manner, in Substance or Modification, riseth again; for our Lord's Body, tho' it was wonderfully changed in Manner and Qualities, at his Glorification, yet it remained the same in *Substance or Essence of a Body*. And yet more fully to detect their Fallacy, the following Quotations will prove, That they look for no Resurrection of the Body out of the Grave, at the end of the World; but all the Resurrection they look for, is, The New Birth, or what they expect, as some of them say, immediately after Death, which, to be sure, is no part of the Body that is laid in the Grave. But whereas he saith, that *W. P.*'s and *T. Elwood*'s Arguments about the Resurrection have not been answer'd by their Opposers, is false; they have been sufficiently Answer'd again and again, as *The Snake in the Grass*, *Satan Disrob'd*, and in my *First*, *Second*, and *Third Narratives*.

G. Whitehead in *Christian Quaker*, p. 353. brings *T. Danson* saying, The happiness of the Soul is not perfect without the Body, its dear and beloved Companion; the Soul having a strong desire and inclination to a re-union to the Body, as the Schools not without ground determine, *&c.*

To this *G. W.* Answers; Both *Calvin*, *T. Danson*, the Schools, and divers Anabaptists, are mistaken in this very matter, and see not with the Eye of true Faith, either that the happiness of the Soul is not perfect without the Body, or that the Soul hath a strong desire to a re-union to the Body, while they intend the terrestrial elementary Bodies; for this implies the Soul to be in a kind of Purgatory, or disquietness, till the supposed Resumption of the Body.

To the same effect doth *W. P.* argue against *T. Hicks*, *Reason against Railing*, p. 137. He quotes *T. Hicks* arguing for the Resurrection of the Body; the Joy's of Heaven imperfect else. To this *W. Penn* opposeth. I Answer, Is the Joy of the Ancients, now in Glory, imperfect? Or are they in Heaven but by halves? If it be so unequitable, that the Body which hath suffer'd should not partake of the Joys Celestial, is it not in measure unequal, that the Soul should be rewarded so long before the Body? This Principle brings to the Mortality of the Soul (held by many Baptists)

or

or I am mistaken. But why must the Felicity of the Soul, depend upon that of the Body? Is it not to make the Soul a kind of Widow,, and so in a state of Mourning and Disconsolateness, which state is but a better sort of Purgatory.

Note, We see from both their Reasonings, they would infer divers absurdities, that would follow upon that Doctrine, that the Souls of the deceased Saints now in Glory, do look for a re-union to their Bodies, which they put off at the Bodily Death. So that by their manner of Reasoning, as well as their expres Words, they declare themselves in their own behalf, and in the Name of the Quakers, whose Faith they pretend to give an account of, to be positive Unbelievers as concerning any Resurrection of the Body that Dyeth, or any re-union of that Body, to the Soul to which it was formerly united before the Bodily Death. But still *G. W.* as his manner is, perverts the true state of the question by his saying, While they intend the terrestrial elementary Bodies: For if he mean that the Bodies after they are raised shall have the same terrestrial elementary Qualities, Passions and Accidents, that they had before Death, he wrongs his Opponents, for none of them have so affirmed: But if he mean the same Substance or Essence of Bodies, under more excellent Qualities and Endowments, as far excelling the former, as Spiritual excells Natural, or Animal and Carnal, Immortal and Incorruptible excells Mortal and Corruptible, and Heavenly excells Earthly, they are the same: For in all changes that Bodies are capable of, as well as Souls or Spirits, from worse to better; the subject of these changes must remain the same, and that is what is justly called the Substance, as when the Soul or Mind of Man is converted and changed from Earthly affections to Heavenly, the Subject or Substance which is the Soul or Mind is the same, and by as good Reason, when a Body is changed from Earthly qualities to Heavenly, the Body is still the same Substance or Subject, tho' changed in Qualities and Conditions: For further proofs out of both *G. W.* and *W. P.* I refer to my Third Narrative, p. 26, 27, 28.

Again, *Rich. Hubbertborne*, a great Author among the Quakers in his *Coll.* p. 121. proceedeth at the same rate against the deceased Saints, looking for the Resurrection of their Bodies.——And these are they (saith he) that plead for a Life in Sin, while they are here, and that say, that the Saints glorified in Heaven, do yet hope, *For the Resurrection of their Bodies*, and so not come to the end of their hope, tho' in Heaven, when as the Saints upon Earth, witnessed the end of their hope the Salvation of their Souls. Now these may well deny perfection on Earth, who deny it in Heaven, which the Saints, *we* and the Scriptures do witness it in, both and against all such, who are not fit to speak of the things of God. See further in my Third Narrative, p. 29.

Note, Here again, *G. W.*'s gross Fallacy and Sophistry, *Truth and Innoc.* p. 59. as if *Rich. Hubbertborne* had only opposed the Doctrine of the glorified Saints in Heaven, not being perfect, which is a most deceitful Evasion, by misstating the Controversie, *R. Hub.* here is not disputing a-

gainſt the Papiſts who maintain a Purgatory, but againſt a Proteſtant Author, who did hold, That all the deceased Saints, are perfect with a ſinleſs perfection, but it doth not therefore follow, that they do not in that ſinleſs ſtate, hope for the Reſurrection of their Bodies, which yet is *R. Hubb.*'s inference, by which he doth plainly diſcover his, and his Brethrens infidelity in that great Article of the Chriſtian Faith, *viz.* the Reſurrection of the Body.

Again, in *Coll.* p. 275. he gives us his ſenſe of the Reſurrection. "The "Seeds (he ſaith) are but two in the whole World [*viz.* the Seed of the "Woman, and the Seed of the *Serpent*] having each Seed its own Body, "and in every one, until the one be caſt out, and every one of theſe two "Seeds in every Man ſhall ariſe in its own order, the one ſhall riſe "unto everlaſting Life, the other unto Condemnation.——Chriſt the "Seed made his Grave, IN the Wicked, and IN the Rich in his Death, "and out of that Grave ſhall riſe with his Body unto everlaſting Life, "if thou canſt receive it, thou may'ſt be ſatisfied. Are not theſe Words horrid Perverſions of Scripture, and containing abominable Blaſphemy!

Again, *G. F.* in his *Diſtinction betwixt the Two Suppers*, p. 20. ſaith,—"And "the Apoſtle ſaid, that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Dead, both of the "Juſt and Unjuſt, and for Preaching the Reſurrection of the Dead (namely, "Chriſt Jeſus) he was called in queſtion, *Acts* 24. 15, 21. And in *p.* 31. quoting "2 *Tim.* 2. 17, 18. he ſaith, But *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* concerning the Truth "erred, who ſaid that the Reſurrection was paſt already; ſuch overthrew "People from the Faith, that ſtands in Chriſt, who is the Reſurrection and "the Life, through which Faith, they attained to the Reſurrection, and "had their vile Bodies changed, and made like unto his Glorious Body.

Note, How he perverts the Scripture both in words and ſenſe; the Scripture words, *Who ſhall change our vile or low Bodies*, reſpecting the time to come, at the Reſurrection of the Dead; but he ſaith, they attained the Reſurrection, and had their vile Bodies changed, as a thing already fulfilled. Alſo he makes the Reſurrection that *Paul* Preached in the *Acts* 17. 18, 22. and 23. 6. to be Chriſt himſelf, perverting our Saviour's words, who called himſelf the Reſurrection and the Life, to a literal ſenſe, which (as is obvious to all intelligent Perſons) contain a figurative ſenſe, to wit, the metonymy of the Cauſe getting the Name of the Effect, as is frequent in Scripture, and in all Authors; as when God is call'd in Scripture the Saints Hope, and Confidence, and Salvation, *i. e.* the Author and Cauſe of their Hope, Confidence and Salvation.

Tenthly,

Tenthly, *Concerning the Quakers Notion of the Light Within.*

THE true Doctrine and Senſe of the *Light Within*, as a Divine and Supernatural Gift of God, given to all faithful Chriſtians, of whom it is truly ſaid (as *David* ſaid, concerning himſelf) *The Lord is their Light and their Salvation*; and alſo that *Chriſt the Eternal and Eſſential Word*, who was in the beginning with God, and was and is God, is that true *Light, that doth enlighten every Man that cometh into the World*, even Heathens and all Individuals of Mankind, with a common and univerſal Illumination, Diſcovery and Knowledge, of certain moral Principles, of Juſtice and Temperance; and alſo of ſome general knowledge of God, as the great Creator and Ruler of the World, and of ſome general moral Duties towards him as ſuch, [whether by certain innate impreſſions preventing the exerciſe and actings of the rational Faculty, or by exciting and awakening the rational Faculty of the Soul, as it is enlightned and aſſiſted by God Almighty, as the primary Cauſe, and by the works of Creation and of general Providence, as ſecondary Cauſes; whether one or both of theſe ways is not ſo neceſſary at preſent to determine,] is a Doctrine well warranted by Scripture, and conſented unto by the generality of Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, and which I not only conſent unto, but highly value as an excellent Principle, labouring daily, by the Grace of God, practically to improve whatever true Light within I have, both Common and Special, and, I hope, ever I ſhall ſo do, and ſo I pray that God may enable all and me to do the ſame: But the Quakers Notion of the Light within, held in general by them, and authentickly received from their Principal Teachers, particularly *G. F. G. W. E. Bur.* and others, is extremely contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and alſo to the beſt dictates of our rational Faculties, to which no divine Light, either within Men or without Men, can contradict.

To ſhow which hath been a principal part of my buſineſs in all the the three Meetings, above-mention'd, and is the ſame in all the three Parts of this Narrative, the which contrariety I intend to ſhow in a ſhort Scheme of their abſurd, unſcriptural, as well as irrational Notions of what they call the Light within; which, upon due examination, will be found to be Darkneſs, and not Light, within.

1. It's natural to Man to have a Supernatural Light, *W. P.*'s *Prin. Chriſt.* p. 15.

2. There is no natural Light in Men, *Prin. Chriſt.* p. 30. There are not two Lights in Men, *p.* 31. Thus he allows no diſtinction betwixt natural Reaſon, which is a good and true Light, and Gift of God to Men, and the Light of Faith, given to all true Chriſtians, and the Light of prophetical Inſpirations given to the holy Prophets and Apoſtles, but confounds them, by making them all to be one and the ſame thing, whereas they are all very diſtinct, tho' all coming from one Fountain and Author, God, the Father of Lights.

3. Man

3. Man at his coming into the World hath a Light from Christ, which is more than Conscience, *G. F.'s G. M.* p. 209.

4. And seeing the Light is but dim in Heathens and Christians, and Prophets and Apostles, by *Prin. Christ.* as above-quoted, no Man has, or ever had, any other Light, but what he had at his coming into the World.

5. The Light within, not only true Christians, but within all Men, *Heathens, Turks, Jews*, is sufficient to Salvation without any thing else, *G.W.'s Antid.* p. 28. Thus the Man Christ without us (who is both God and Man) and his Death and Sufferings, and Blood outwardly shed, and Mediation for us in Heaven, are all excluded from being so much as concurring Causes of our Salvation.

6. The Light within every Man (litterally understood without any Metonymy) is God, Christ, the Holy Ghost, the Unction or Anointing, is blinded in some by the God of this World (*G. F. News out of the North*, p. 19.) is Crucified, Imprisoned, Slain, in wicked Men, and its Blood is shed in them, and that is the Blood that they trod under feet (see the places above-quoted) and is the Blood of Atonement.

7. This Light is first a Seed, then a new born Child, and lastly, the Mighty God; see *W. P.'s* and *W. B.'s* words above-quoted.

8. This Light within being God, *&c.* teacheth the Quakers immediately and infallibly, as it did the Prophets and Apostles, and they Speak and Write from the same Prophetical Illumination and Inspiration that the Prophets and Apostles had; yea, from the same degree, at least some of them; and *G. F.* was come to the same Fulness that was in Christ, and the Works of their Ministry is to bring People to the same Fulness, that was in Christ, that it may be in them, *i. e.* to make them all equal to Christ and God, as above-quoted.

9. The Light within, teacheth them, what they Preach and Write without the Scriptures, being the means, or a means to help or assist them in so Preaching and Writing: hence it is that *E. B.* upbraids all Protestant Ministers, *Coll.* p. 126. saying——Their Prophecy and Preaching would soon be ended, if they had not the Scripture, which is other Men's Words, and that which was spoken to others, to speak their imaginations from.

10. That this Light within every Man, is the Gospel, the Power of God, unto Salvation, to every one that believeth in it, and is the alone Object of Faith, [as above-quoted] and that Prophet whom God promised to raise up.

11. That the Light within every Man, is the Rule of Faith, and Life to all Men, as above-quoted, yea, a full Rule to lead to Salvation, where it is obeyed. The Glory of Christ's Light within, *by G. W.* and others *p.* 52. and *p.* 28. from the Light of Christ within, they [*i. e.* all Men] have so much of the Instructions or Precepts therein [in Scripture] contained as are necessary to Salvation. *Note*, This is to teach People to be saved, by a meer Covenant of Works, Do and live, which none ever yet fulfilled, but Christ, for all have sinned, *Rom.* 3.

12. This

12. This Light within them is whole Christ, God and Man, Flesh and Spirit, *G. F. G. M.* p. 246. 249. and *G. F.* is so much for the Flesh, Body, Blood and Bones of Christ within, that he denyeth that Christ has any Body that is absent from his People, and is now in the presence of his Father, *G. M.* p. 211.

13. It is the Flesh and Bone of Christ, a measure in one, and a measure in another. *Note*, This is to make the whole to be the part and the part or (*G. M.* 246.) measure to be the whole.

14. The Saints eat his Flesh, and they that eat this Flesh, hath it within them. *G. M.* p. 322. Thus arguing most grosly from a Metaphorical eating to a Literal.

15. The Light within is the Urim and Thummim, as *G. W.* says *Truth and Inno.* p. 16. which not only the Quakers have, but all Men, Heathens and Infidels as really as they.

16. Christ within is the Doctrine of Salvation, which IS ONLY necessary to be Preached, and he is a deceiver, that exhorts People for Salvation to any other thing than the Light of Christ, as he hath enlightned them within.

Note, This evidently appears from those passages in *E. B.*'s *The true Faith of the Gospel of Peace*, p. 29. 30. quoted in that called, *Some account from Colchester*, signed by Seven Quakers above mentioned, [the whole of which account is in the several heads of this Narrative fully replyed unto] which these Seven Quakers are so far from Censuring, that they have justified them, *p.* 16. 17. But to hide their deceit in their reply they transpose the Words of *E. B.* in his Q. 12. which were *the Light of Christ* to *Christ* who is that *true Light*, whereas it is manifest, that by Christ that *true Light*, they meant the same which *E. B.* viz. ONLY *the Light within.*

Again, in their *p.* 17, 18. they justify *G. W.*'s saying, *They* that *want infallibility, and have not the Spirit of Christ, they are out of the truth, and are fallible, and their Ministry is not of the Spirit.*

Note, Here they not only disown such Ministers who have not the Spirit, but who are fallible in any case; for that's the true state of the Controverse, as stated betwixt *G. W.* and *T. D. Voice of Wisdom*, p. 33. Want of infallibility is a valid Plea against the Ministry; let the intelligent therefore judge whether *G. W.*'s fallibility sufficiently proved in this Narrative, as well as that of his Brethren by his Argument, has not manifestly discovered him and them to be no Ministers of Christ.]

Note, Their faulting so much, some small Errors of the Press no wise material, as by the Original manuscript yet extant, and ready to be produced, if required, is to be seen, shows their quibling Humour, straining at a *Gnat*, and swallowing down a *Camel*; as also their querying if this or that of the Quotations brought against them be against the Foundation of the Christian Religion, as was laid in the Title-Page of the Sheet, to which they have made a pretended reply; but are they so ignorant as not to know that every Error is against the Foundation, in some degrees though every Error is not Fundamental, so as to destroy the Foundation,

tion, 2. That Errors as well as other ill things receive their denomination from the greater and worſe part; as indeed, the far greateſt part of all therein contained is deſtructive to the very Foundation of Chriſtian Religion, as is on the ſeveral Heads plainly ſhown.

And as to the Printed Teſtimony of *John Gledhill*, Nonconformiſt Miniſter, which they have prefixed to their *Some Account*, it avails them nothing, for he grants that he did witneſs to the truth of the Quotations, and no more was deſired from him. The Printing of his Name without his knowledge and conſent, reflects no blame on the Perſon who deſired him to ſet his hand to it, even tho' he told him, that that Paper was not deſigned for the Preſs, for that Perſon did not put it to the Preſs, but it was Printed without his leave or conſent; and the Perſon who put it to the Preſs, was under no tye to hinder him from ſo doing, but judged it would be of Service to the Truth to make it publick, as he ſtill ſo judgeth; and it is no diſhonour to *J. Gledhill*, nor his Brethren, but commendable to have their Names in Print, to atteſt to the great Truths of the Goſpel, in oppoſition to the Quakers great Errors, that do ſo manifeſtly contradict them. And it would be yet more commendable in him and them, to bear a more full and zealous Teſtimony againſt them, to ſtop the gangrene of the Quakers vile Errors, that have ſo much prevailed in *Colcheſter*, as in many other places of the Nation.

Note, By this and all the foregoing Quotations it is ſufficiently evident, that the Light within, not as taught by the Scriptures, but as taught by the Quakers, hath led them into manifold Blaſphemies, and vile Errors, as the *Norfolk* Miniſters have moſt juſtly charged them, concerning God, Chriſt and the holy Scriptures.

11thly, *and* 12thly, *Concerning Baptiſm and the Lord's-Supper.*

IN a Book, call'd, *Some Principles of the Elect People of God, in Scorn call'd Quakers*, p. 75. "The Baptiſm we own, which is the Baptiſm of "Chriſt, with the Holy Ghoſt and with Fire, *but we deny all other*; for there "is but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all; "add they who would have one Baptiſm outward and another inward, "would have two Baptiſms, when the Scripture ſaith the Baptiſm is but "one; and whoſoever hath the Baptiſm outward, are the ſame they were "before, but the Baptiſm of Chriſt makes a new Creature. —— And now "I ſee the other to be formal Imitation, and the invention of Man, and "ſo a meer Deluſion; and all are Heathens, and no Chriſtians, who cannot witneſs this Baptiſm, *Matth.* 15. 4. who can witneſs this DENIES "ALL OTHER; for the Scripture ſaith, the Baptiſm is but one. And in "p. 76. —— And are without, feeding upon the Huſk and Shadow, which "is carnal; for the Bread which the World breaks, is Carnal and Natu-

"ral

" ral, and only feeds the outward carnal Body, and goeth into the Belly,
" and ſo paſſeth out into the Dunghil; and ſo likewiſe the Cup which
" they drink, and ſo the Communion and Fellowſhip of the World paſ-
" ſeth away; but this is no nouriſhment to the Soul, but ſtill the Soul lies
" in Death, and here is no Commnnion, but natural, outward and car-
" nal, of ſeveral Minds and Hearts, full of Filthineſs and Uncleanneſs,
" which IS THE TABLE OF DEVILS, Eating and Drinking their own
" Damnation, not diſcerning the Lord's Body, which is Spiritual, which
" the natural Man diſcerns not.

W. P. in his *Reaſon againſt Railing*, p. 108. —— " I affirm, by that one
" Scripture [*Heb.* 9. 10.] Circumciſion is as much in force, as *Water-Bap-*
" *tiſm*, and the Paſchal Lamb, *as Bread and Wine*, they were both Shadows,
" and both elementary and periſhable.

" And we can teſtifie FROM THE SAME SPIRIT, by which *Paul* re-
" nounced Circumciſion, that they are to be rejected, as not now required;
" neither have they, ſince the falſe Church eſpouſed and exalted them,
" ever been taken up afreſh by God's Command, or in the leading of his
" Eternal Spirit; and the Lord will appear to gather his People out of them,
" but never to eſtabliſh or keep People in them.

Note, Notwithſtanding the ſevere Cenſure that the Quakers have paſſed on the outward Adminiſtration of Baptiſm and the Lord's-Supper, in the former Quotation, and *W. Penn* in this latter Quotation; in the one they ſay, Baptiſm with Water, and the Lord's-Supper, with Bread and Wine, are to BE DENYED, WE DENY (ſay they) ALL OTHER; and in the other *W. P.* ſaith, they are to be REJECTED, and this (he ſaith) they can teſtifie from the ſame Spirit by which *Paul* renounced Circumciſion; yet *W. Penn*, in his *Key*, Printed at *London*, 1699. ſaith, —— *Hence it is that the People call'd Quakers, cannot be ſaid to deny them* [*viz.* the outward Adminiſtration of Baptiſm and the Supper] *that is* (ſaith he) *too hard a Word*, —— *But they leave them off, as fulfilled in Chriſt, who is in them, their hope of Glory.* Is there not here a palpable contradiction betwixt *W. Penn* and his Brethren? He ſaith in his *Key*, p. 28. *The People call'd Quakers cannot be ſaid to deny them, that's too hard*; and yet in the former Quotation, they have uſed that very ſame Word, —— *WE DENY ALL OTHER*, ſay they; and call it *the Invention of Man, and ſo a meer Deluſion.*

But it is fearful Deluſion in them, to call theſe ſo ſolemn Inſtitutions of our Bleſſed Saviour, expreſly enjoyn'd to the end of the World, and his coming to Judgment, by ſuch Names; yea, and the like contradiction is found betwixt *W. P.* in his *Reaſon againſt Railing*, in the Year 1673. and the ſame *W. P.* in his *Key*, Printed 1699. In the former he ſaith, *We can teſtifie from the ſame Spirit by which* Paul *rejected Circumciſion, that they are to be rejected*; In the latter he ſaith, *The People call'd Quakers cannot be ſaid to deny them, that's too hard a Word*; yet we ſee they have denyed them, both by Practiſe and verbal Confeſſion; yea, and rejected them, and with no leſs pretended Authority, than the ſame Spirit by which *Paul* rejected Circumciſion.

Where is now the Unity they boaſt of? ſeeing in this, as well as in divers other things of great weight, they are ſo contradictory and unconſtant to themſelves, and yet without all change, if we will believe them.

And notwithſtanding the ſevere Cenſure that the Quakers in general, and *G. W.* in particular, have paſſed on Baptiſm and the Lord's-Supper, outwardly Adminiſtred, calling them, *the Invention of Man, a meer Deluſion*, and *Idolatry*, and the *Lord's-Supper, The Table of Devils, and the Cup of Devils*: yet *G. W.* in his *Antidote*, p. 114. Printed 1697, pretends a great deal of Moderation and Charity to ſome who practiſe them, but without any change in him ——— "And tho' too many now are very Formal and "Superſtitious in thoſe outward Obſervations and Shadows, laying ſo much "ſtreſs for Salvation upon them, that they neglect the Subſtance, yet others "being more conſcientiouſly tender in the obſervation thereof, we are "the more tender to theſe, ſo as not to cenſure or condemn them meerly "for practiſing that which they believe is their Duty, either in breaking of Bread, or Water Baptiſm, yet deſire they may ſee further.

Note, What can this ſmooth Language of *W. P.* and *G. W.* concerning Baptiſm and the Supper now of late Years import or ſignifie to all impartial Perſons, but that thereby they ſeek to deceive the weak and ſimple, ſeeing they will not acknowledge, that they are changed in any reſpect from what they were in the beginning, either in point of Perſwaſion, or Charity? They mean the ſame now, as when they called them, univerſally and without exception, beggarly Elements, worldly Rudiments, Idolatry, Invention of Man, and meer Deluſion?

But ſeeing they are not changed in their Faith and Perſwaſion, concerning Water Baptiſm and the Supper, they cannot with any good Conſcience be changed in their being more charitable now then formerly, ſo that *G. W.*'s ſaying, they do not cenſure or condemn them, who are more conſcientiouſly tender in the obſervation thereof, meerly for practiſing that which they believe is their duty, is a meer fallacy. Do they not condemn all viſible Chriſtian Societies but their own, and call them *Apoſtates, the World, Idolaters, Worſhippers of* Baal, *and the Preachers belonging to thoſe Societies Prieſts of* Baal, *&c.* Do they not cenſure them, who practiſe Idolatry, and Man's Invention, and meer Deluſion? as they have paſt Judgment on thoſe outward practiſes, to be ſuch. And if People's practiſing what they believe is their Duty, being miſled by an erring Conſcience, and Ignorance of Mind (as the Quakers think all are ſo miſled who practiſe the outward Baptiſm and Supper) can excuſe them from cenſure, according to *G. W.*'s way of Argument, they may extend as much Charity, not only to Judaiſing Chriſtians, that would practiſe outward Circumciſion, but to *Infidels, Jews* and *Mahometans*; yea, and the moſt Superſtitious and Idolatrous Papiſts, for no doubt many of them practiſe what they believe is their Duty, when they pray to the *Virgin Mary*, and other Saints, and adore the Bread in the Maſs, being miſled by an erring Conſcience, to believe it is the real Body of Chriſt.

But they falſely infer, that becauſe unworthy Perſons do partake of the outward Supper, that therefore it is the Table of Devils, and the Cup of Devils,

Devils, *Paul* did not say, he that Eats and Drinks unworthily, Eats at the Table of Devils; *But he that eats this Bread, and drinks this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 11. 27. Thus we see that according to Scripture, that Cup which the unworthy drink is the Cup of the Lord, and not the Cup of Devils, and that Bread which they eat is the Bread of the Lord, as *Augustine* said, the unworthy they eat *Panem Domini*, but not *Panem Dominum* the Bread of the Lord, but not the Bread which is the Lord?

Some of the Quakers said, *George*, seeing thou art for the outward Baptism and the Supper, why dost thou not practise them.

To this I gave the following account, which many declared was satisfactory unto them, that not having an outward Call, I ought not to administer them to others upon the pretence of an inward extraordinary Call, which too many pretend to have. And for my Speaking at *Turners-Hall*, and elsewhere as I had occasion, I do not pretend to any extraordinary Call in so doing, but what I did, was what a private Christian, who has a Spiritual Gift and Ability given him of God (especially to oppose Heresie) may and ought to do, to teach his Neighbours Catechistically (not to set up any Sect, or make any Schism) as *Origine* taught in Christian Assemblies, when a Lay-man, before he received Ordination; and so did others, as *Eusebius* showeth in his Church-History: And as to Baptism, I was satisfied with what I had received in Infancy, being Born of Christian Parents; for I believe, That Baptism, being a Seal of God's Covenant of Grace, doth as really belong to Infant Children of Believers under the New Testament, as Circumcision did to Infant Children of Believers under the Old Testament. Next as concerning the Lord's-Supper, after it pleased God to convince me that it is an Institution of Christ, and let me see my Error and Sin, in rejecting it, for which I have been humbled before God, and asked his Forgiveness, and which, I hope, God for Christ's sake, has given me; I had some considerable time of hesitation, about the lawful and due Administrator, and after I had clearness in that, I delay'd for some time, for the sake of some others, lest my forwardness should be an hindrance and offence to them; but, through Mercy, that being much removed, I became uneasie to delay it longer, so that I declar'd I did intend, God willing, with the first opportunity, to receive it. And whereas my Adversaries among the Quakers did object against me, that I am a Member of no visible Society, and on that pretence refuse to have any publick Dispute or Conference with me. To this I answer'd, first, Supposing it were so, why should that be made a Crime in me, which *W. P.* in his *Preface* to *G. Fox's Journal*, esteem'd so great a Virtue in *G. Fox*, viz. *That he was of no particular Society*; but, secondly, I told them I was a Member of the Catholick Church of Christ, and I did own the Church of *England* to be a part of the Catholick Church, and other Protestant Churches to be other parts of the same.

In the close of the Meeting I told the Auditory, I was ready, by God's Assistance, to prove against my Adversaries, the Chief Leaders and Teachers of the Quakers, particularly *George Whitehead*, *Jos. Wyeth*, and them of the

Second-Days-Meeting at *London*, who have approv'd the Quakers Books, That they do not believe *One Article of that call'd the Apoſtles Creed*, in the true ſenſe of Scripture, and of all true and Orthodox Chriſtians throughout the World; and I deſir'd the Quakers preſent, to acquaint their Brethren with my ſaid Propoſal: I alſo told the Auditory, that the falſe pretences of the Quakers Teachers to extraordinary prophetical Inſpirations gave them the juſt Character of falſe Prophets, and all ſuch who had the like falſe pretences with them; and that none could juſtly be ſo called, however otherwiſe unſound or miſtaken, that had not thoſe high pretences. That it was ſome of the moſt crying Sins committed in this Land, that ſo many falſe Prophets ſhould abound in it, ſpeaking Lyes in the Name of the Lord, and ſaying, *Thus ſaith the Lord*, pretending the ſame *Immediate Meſſage and Authority* that the true Prophets had, whenas they can give no proof of it, but many undeniable proofs can be given to the contrary, as particularly their vile Antichriſtian Errors publiſh'd in their Books, and that lewd Swearing and open Prophanation of the Name of God, are not greater Sins, nor ſo great nor dangerous, in many reſpects, as their ſpeaking Lyes in *the Name of the Lord*, and entituling their vile Errors and Blaſphemies to the Spirit of God, as they commonly do.

POST-SCRIPT.

FOR an Evidence of my owning the Church of *England*, to be a part of the true Catholick Church of Chriſt, I did with great inward Peace and Satisfaction, I bleſs God, receive the Lord's-Supper, by *D. Bedford*, in his Church in *Buttolph-lane*, with others of that Congregation, the firſt Lord's Day of the Month of *February*, 1699, and ſince again in the ſame place, by the ſame Perſon, the firſt Lord's Day of this Inſtant Month of *March*, 1699. On which ſame day *Robert Bridgeman*, and *Margaret Everard*, and ſome other of my Friends (formerly under the profeſſion of Quakers, and in great repute among that People, whom God, in his great Mercy, hath of late times enlightned, to ſee their former Error, and to renounce it) did receive the Lord's-Supper in *Huntington*, and have declar'd that they receiv'd it with great inward Peace and Satisfaction; the account whereof I have from the ſaid *Robert Bridgeman*, by his Letter to me, bearing Date the 5th of this Inſtant; in which Letter he alſo informs me, and in another of a former Date, of about Ten of my Friends in *Huntington* and *Godmanchester*, and there-about, who formerly were Quakers all of good repute, who now go to Church there; and that *Margaret Everard* has had her youngeſt Son, and three Daughters lately Baptized: Alſo, by Letters from *Bedford*, I have an account, that ſome both in the Town and County of *Bedford* are come off from the Quakers and gone to Church, particularly

W. Mather

Wm. Mather and his Wife: also at *Reading*, divers who were formerly Quakers and were so Educated, have gone to Church and have been Baptized, and some there have brought their Children to be Baptized, and here at *London*, divers of both Sexes who were educated under the profession of Quakers have been lately Baptized and go to Church, one of whom is my Youngest Daughter, my Elder Daughter having been Baptized above a Year ago, so that to my certain knowledge above forty Persons within a few Months past are come off from Quakerism, and brought to the Church, which gives a good ground of hope, that many others will follow, which God in his great Mercy grant, and prosper my sincere, tho' mean Endeavours and Labours, and other his Servants, whom he has made instrumental in this Work, and for the success he has been pleased to give us therein, all Glory, and Honour and Praise be given to his most worthy Name, through Jesus Christ, Amen. And whereas my adversaries *G. W.* and other of the Preachers of the Second Days meeting at *London*, had given it as a reason why they would not meet me at *Turners-Hall*, to dispute with me, at the former Meetings for the Years 1696, 97, 98, according to my published Advertisements, that they knew none who had been in Unity with them, since I came into *England*, who did own me, or were in danger by me to be brought off from them, that Objection, to their Knowledge and full Conviction, is now quite removed, for both *R. Bridgeman* and *M. Everard*, (besides divers others that might be mentioned) were not only in Unity with them, since my arrival into *England*, but in great repute among them. *R. Bridgeman*, having been but lately a Member of their Men's Meetings at *London*, and one of the Twelve, who were entrusted with the receiving and distributing the Money collected for their poor in the City of *London*; and *Margaret Everard* having for many Years, till of very late, been received and well owned as a Speaker among them, both in City and Country. And it is most certain, that the Quakers refusing to meet with me, at *Turners-Hall*, to answer to the Quotations I produced out of their Books, has been a great means to let many of those formerly in Unity with them, see their sandy Foundation, and the badness of their Cause, and will yet be a further means to give many others the like discovery, who are dissatisfied with their not appearing either to vindicate their Books and Authors, or to acknowledge the great Errors contained in them, and publickly to retract them. They are indeed brought to a very pinching dilemma, if they will not appear in publick view, to answer to the charges of the vile Errors and Heresies, yea, and Blasphemes brought against them, by plain Quotations out of their Books presented to the People present by ocular inspection, they now see by experience of what is past, what the consequence will be, even that many of themselves will see they have a bad Cause, which because they are not able to defend, they find out and devise frivolous excuses, why they will not appear. And if they will appear, there is the like and equal danger, that their Errors, Heresies and Blasphemies will be detected to their own People, as indeed the last Meetings, where some of them, (though none principally concerned,) did appear, have had a good service in some owned by them, to give them a discovery of them.

There

There remains but two ſhadows of Reaſon why they will not appear, one is, that it is offenſive to civil Authority, but this is a meer pretence, for whatever offence it may be to ſome particular Perſons that may too much favour their errors, yet it can be no juſt offence to Civil Authority, there being no Law againſt it, and where no Law is, there is no tranſgreſſion, nor can it be ſuppoſed, that it can offend the civil Authority, that ſuch an innocent and probable way to reduce the Quakers from their vile Hereſie, which God has in meaſure manifeſtly bleſſed with ſome Succeſs, and to bring them to the Church, is uſed to that effect: For, muſt not ſome means be uſed to reclaim them, and what means ſo probable as this? The Act of Tolleration, to be ſure, doth not forbid any, by fair Reaſon and Argument, to deal with them, for their Convincement; and for an Inſtance, that this manner of proceeding is not offenſive to Authority, I had the leave of the *Lord Mayor of London*, for each of the Meetings I have yet had.

Their other ſhadow of Reaſon, is, That they think it better to Anſwer in Print to what is objected againſt them, out of their Books, than by Word of Mouth. I confeſs, indeed, it is the moſt ready and expedient way for them to hide and cloak their vile Errors, and boldly to deny them, whenever ſo juſtly charg'd with them, by their Sophiſtical Quibling and Evaſions; and particularly, by their boldly aſſerting the Quotations to be falſely, or lamely given, when they are ever ſo truly and fully given, which not one of many thouſands, ſimply by Reading their pretended Anſwers and Defences in Print, can be able to judge, whether the Quotations be true or falſe, perfect or lame; becauſe they have not, nor can they eaſily find out the Books, out of which the Quotations are taken, whereby to compare them; and ſuppoſe the Books could be found, yet few will beſtow ſo much, either time or labour, to compare them; whereas the preſenting the Books and the Quotations contain'd in them, by Ocular inſpection, to Perſons preſent, ſaves all that labour, and is the ſureſt and readieſt way, to find out the truth of Matters, in point of Truth or Error, and whether or not the Quakers are juſtly charged with thoſe Errors. Beſide, if they think their Anſwering to the Charges againſt them, by Print, be profitable to them, had they Truth on their ſide, they would be ready to defend their Principles and Profeſſion both ways, that is, both by Word of Mouth, and alſo by their Pens, for ſtill two ways are better than one; if both be proper to the ſame true end, which is the Diſcovery of Truth and Error.

But notwithſtanding of their brags, and telling that they have Anſwered me from time to time in Print, yet this is but an empty flouriſh; divers of my chiefeſt Books againſt them, for the detection of their Errors, they have not given the leaſt Reply unto; as my Second and Third *Narratives*; my Book, call'd, *The Quakers Arguments againſt Baptiſm and the Supper*, &c. *Examin'd and Refuted*; my *Larger and Shorter Catechiſms*; my Book, call'd, *The Deiſm of* W. Penn, and that call'd, *The Fallacies of* W. P. *and his Brethren*, &c. And tho' *T. Elwood* Printed a pretended Reply to my *Firſt Narrative*, yet the Anſwer given to it, call'd, *Satan Diſrob'd*, which hath

hath effectually discover'd the falseness and folly of it, hath not received an Answer from them to this Day. And their usual way of answering Books writ against them, is to Quible and Evade in some few particulars, and wholly to pass by the most material things urged against them: And yet to boast and brag, that they have given a sufficient Answer.

And whereas *Jos. Wyeth*, in his Printed Paper, in Answer to my late Printed Advertisement, saith, *They* (i. e. the Quakers) *in common with all Protestant Dissenters, are Intituled to the peaceable Profession of their Christian Principles, and may be deemed imprudent to call it in Question*, &c. To this I say, it is a meer begging the Question, That either their Principles are Christian, or that they are Intitul'd to the peaceable Profession of what they call so, *In Common with Protestant Dissenters*. The Act of Toleration has no more declared their Principles to be Christian, than the Toleration that *Holland* and other *Common-wealths*, have given to *Jews* and *Papists*, doth declare their Principle to be Christian. Besides, tho' the Quakers think it imprudent in them, to call their Principles or Profession in question, yet it is no breach of the Act of Toleration, nor imprudence in me, or any, who have sufficient evidence to give of their Unchristian, yea, Antichristian Principles, to call them in question, and that publickly in the Face of the Nation.

And cannot the Quakers defend their Principles in Sober Disputes, in a Christian Assembly, without breach of Peace, or invading their peaceable Profession? How frequently did they provoke, but some Years ago, to publick Disputes, Ministers of the *Church of England*, whose Religion (was more than Tollerated) was Establish'd by Law? By the Quakers Argument, this was a breach of the Peace, and an Invasion of the peaceable Profession of the Religion Establish'd by Law in the Nation.

But, to deal plainly with them, I do not think that either the Profession of *G. Whitehead*, or *Jos. Wyeth*'s Principles is so much as Tollerated by the Act of Tolleration; and if they will call me to an Account for this my plain dealing with them, before any Judicatory, I shall, by God's Assistance, be ready to Answer.

I neither envy, nor grudge the conniyance they have, but seeing they are become so insolent with their false and unjust pretences, to what they have not, as if the Act of Tolleration did not only give them a permission, but did entitle them to a peaceable profession of their most Antichristian Principles, which they most falsely call Christian, that their Principles may not be called in question, and fairly examined, and the falshood of them detected in that publick manner that I have hitherto used; it is high time to tell them of their mistake, that the Act of Tolleration doth neither of them, and that therefore the best and only safest and readiest way to be included in the Act of Tolleration, is for them to reject, retract and renounce their vile errors, especially those against the holy and ever blessed Trinity, whereof I have sufficiently proved them guilty in this foregoing Narrative. *Jos. Wyeth* indeed, hints at the most politick Reason they have for refusing to meet with me, to hear themselves proved guilty of vile Heresies, that it would be a too publick exposing themselves to the danger of losing

their

their pretence, *to their being intituled to the peaceable profession of their Principles*, which in other words he expresses thus, *To trifle away that for which they account themselves so thankfully engaged to their Superiours, the intent of which he saith*, [viz. The Act of Tolleration] In it's Preamble, is declared to be, *to Unite the King's Protestant Subjects in interest and affection.* Surely by this way of his Arguing he must needs think that to come to a publick, fair, and free Tryal, were to endanger their liberty of Profession, or trifle it away: But how can this trifle away their liberty, if their principles be Christian, and that they are sure, they are by virtue of their Christian principles included in that Act? To suppose their may be a danger *to trifle away their liberty, or peacable profession* of what they call their Christian principles, by publick Tryal, is to suppose, that upon due examination, their principles may be found not to be Christian, which if once discovered *would trifle away that liberty*, and therefore it is their best policy to hide and cover their principles, all that they can, and still lie hid as the *Snake in the Grass*, for the evil doer hates the Light, and is not willing to be brought to the Light. But how little do the Quakers regard the intent of the Act of Tolleration, declared in its Preamble *to Unite the King's Protestant Subjects in interest and affection*, when they continue generally to this very Day, in their *horrid uncharitableness* towards all visible Christian Societies, both *Church* of *England* and all Protestant Churches, *That they are no part of the Church of Christ, that their Religion, and Worship is false and idolatrous, the people belonging to those Societies are Worshippers of* Baal, *and their Ministers Priests of* Baal, *Deceivers, Antichrists, denyers of Christ come in the Flesh, the bane of Soul and Body of Mankind*, &c. And have never to this Day, retracted this Language; is this to *Unite the King's Protestant Subjects in interest and affection*, to rail against that Religion, and Church, whereof the King himself, and the best of his Subjects are members, and to call me and my Friends for owning that Church, and coming into Communion with her, and relinquishing the errors condemned by that Church, Apostates, and Runagadoes, as they have done, and still continue to do. For his insinuation of my envy, which (he saith) increasing, *has led me into a disturbance of Mind, which in its course resembles the returns of a delirious affliction.* I think it not worth noticing further than to give it as an instance of his and their Scornful, Proud and Haughty, as well as Uncharitable and Unchristian Temper and Spirit. They reckon me their Enemy, because I tell them the truth, and labour to rescue them from out of the Snares of Satan, and seeing my sincere labours God has been pleased to bless with success both in *America* and here away, none of their malicious Insinuations or Accusations against me, are nor I hope, shall be of force to stop me from my Christian Duty, to contend earnestly for the Faith of Christ, which they seek to destroy.

Note, Since the last Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, there is come to my hands, a pretended Answer to a Printed half Sheet of mine, call'd, *A Synopsis* W. P.*'s Deism*, by *Benj. Cool*, called, *Sophistry Detected*, of which shortly I purpose (God willing) to give an answer and therein to detect his dull Sophistry, false Quotation, and gross Perversion.

FINIS.

The Correction of Errata, *moſt of which are not material, yet to prevent Critical Objections, are Corrected as follows.*

PAge 1. Line 16. for *truth defended* read *truths defence*. p. 2. l. 19. r. *the* r. *this*. l. 30. after *redemption* ſhould be a break. p. 3. l. 23. after p. 47. r. *'tis contrary to Chriſt to ſay, it is an error that*. l. 41. for *that* r. *the*. p. 4. l. 14. on the Margin for p. 413. r. 463. l. 38. for *counſel* r. *council*. l. 39. after *counceller* ſhould be a break. —— l. 42. before *you* ſhould be [p. 5. l. 21. before *know* r. *and*. p. 6. l. 7. for *he confeſſeth it and* r. *doth not diſown it but*. l. 8. dele *the Spiritual Man judgeth all things*. l. 9. after *World* r. *I am the Way, the Truth and the Life*. p. 7. l. 14. for *haughty* r. *lofty*. l. 16. after *life* r. *and Spirit*. p. 8. l. 20. after *come* r. *up*. l. 36. for 54. r. 45. l. 45. after *Colcheſter* r. p. 12. 13. p. 10. l. 20. after *perfect* ſhould be a break. —— l. 35. before *as* dele *is perfect*. l. laſt. after *broken* ſhould be a break. —— p. 11. on the Margin add *compare*. l. 9. after *adoption* r. p. 217. l. 11. after *Court* r. *G. M.* p. 301. l. 12. after *thing* r. *G. M.* p. 27. *meaning ſurely the Quaker's Church* put within [ ]. l. 21. for *falſe* r. *ſelf*. l. 22. after *marigo* ſhould be a break. —— l. 37. after *theſe* r. *things*. p. 12. l. 44. after *Wiſdom* r. p. 18. p. 13. l. 45. after *which* r. *ſcate*. p. 14. l. 31. on the Margin for *G. W.* r. *G. F.* l. 37. after *witneſs* r. *the Scripture*. l. 46. for *truth* r. *truths*. p. 15. l. 1. after *thou* add *haſt*. p. 15. l. 22. after *Son* r. *any* p. 16. l. 25. for p. 23. r. p. 4. p. 17. 84. after *no* dele *a*. l. 35. before *the female* dele *in*. l. laſt. for *where* r. *when*. p. 18. l. 11. the Quotation out of *Truth and Inno.* p. 10. beginning at *the* and ending at *Chriſt*, ſhould be in Italick. p. 19. dele *no*. p. 23. l. 20. for οὐσιν r. πᾶσιν. l. 32. r. *Chriſtianity*. p. 24. l. 27. for p. 15. r. 155. p. 25. l. 26. after *Quakers* r. 7. l. 29. before *Chapters* for *and* r. *or*. p. 26. l. 30. after *defending* r. p. 18. Q. 29. p. 27. l. 32. for *affirming* r. *ſaying to this purpoſe, Reaſon againſt Railing. p.* 109. p. 28. l. 36. after *Rule* r. *Append. to Chr. Quaker. p.* 141. p. 29. l. 11. after *Nature* r. *G. M.* 246. l. 35. for *erroneous* r. *erronious*. p. 30. l. laſt. for *ſingle* r. *ſingular*. p. 31. l. 36. after *lake* r. p. 10. p. 32. l. 28. for *Doctrins* r. *Darkneſs*. p. 34. l. 6. after *Switch* r. p. 50.— p. 37. l. 11. for 19. r. 18. p. 38. l. 36. *as a Man hath a Coat or Garment but doth not conſiſt of it*, ſhould have been of Roman Letter and within [ ] to diſtinguiſh them from the Quotation. p. 41. l. 43. for *muſt* r. *might*. p. 42. l. 25. after 44. r. *to this effect*. l. 29. for 44. r. 56. p. 43. l. 14. for 21. r. 20. l. 25. after *Figure* r. ——and it is a manifeſt forgery upon me, that Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh was but a Figure or Type of the inward Chriſt or Light within. p. 45. l. 24. after *defence* r. *Truth and Inno. p.* 54. p. 46. l. 3. after *Blood* r. *of*. l. 23. after *Jeruſalem* r. *to it*. l. 24. for *was* r. *is*. l. 31. after *Colcheſter* r. p. 14. p. 47. l. 5. after *Faith* r. *Light and Life*. p. 45. l. 10. for *P.* r. *V.* l. 23. *as is evident in the place quoted*, ſhould be in Italick. p. 47. l. 32. r. *is not*. l. 34. ſhould be in Italick. p. 48. l. 1. after *uſeth* r. *Truth and Inno.* p. 55. l. 26. after *ſaith* add *Truth and Inno.* p. 57. p. 49. l. 16. before *here* r. *Truth*

defended

ERRATA.

defended, p. 23. 24. l. 24. after *it* r. *viz.* l. 37. after *within* dele, p. 30. l. 42. before *they* r. *that*. p. 51. l. 26. after *which* r. *will*. l. 30. r. *shall rise*. after *Life* r. *and*.— p. 52. the two last lines should be put in Italick. p. 54. l. 12. for *an* r. *and*. l. 17. for *terms* r. *term*. p. 56. l. 20. after 293. r *the answer is as it was*. l. 22. after *Womb* r. *a holy thing*. l. last, from the word yet, to l. r. in p. 57. after *greatest* should be put betwixt [ ]. and in Roman Letter. p. 57. l. 12. after *of* dele *the*. l. 14. after *Person* make a break—— l. 17. before *The* should be a break—— p. 58. l. 35. for *Word* r. *Mind*. l. 40. for *for this* r. *his*. l. 44. after *Word* should be a break—— p. 59. l. 11. after *Life* should be a break—— l. 41. after *Colchester* r. *p.* 12. p. 60. l. 1. dele *not* p. 62. l. 18. for *state and* r. *state of*. p. 64. l. last. before *the* r. *Truth and Inn.* p. 9. p. 68. l. 25. for *Israel* r. *Saints*. p. 71. l. penult. for *Manicheus* r. *Manicheans*. p. 72. l. 16. for *and reign* r. *or reign*. p. 81. l. 7. after *is* r. ibid. l. 43. after *Christ* r. *being a meer Spirit*. l. 36. for *above* r. *alone*. p. 82. l. 24. after *Spiritual* r. p. 14. p. 85. l. 30. after *God* r. p. 55. l. 33. before *And* should be a break—— p. 56. l. 40. for *in* r. *is*. after *Types* should be a break—— p. 57. ibid. for *this* r. *his*. l. 45. before *so* should be a Break—— p. 86. l. 8. for *can be* r. *is*. p. 88. l. 12. after *believed* r. *Switch*. p. 38. p. 94. l. 13. after *S. E.* r. *Light and Life*. p. 58. p. 95. l. 16. after *therein* r. *Antidote p.* 224. 225. p. 96. l. 16. for p. 248. r. p. 250. p. 98. l. 29. for 6. r. 26. p. 101. l. 44. after *G. W.* r. *in Truth and Inno.* p. 105. l. 32. dele *the*. p. 106. l. 3. for *dim* r. *one*. l. 18. after *this Light* r. *in Believers and regenerate Persons*. l. 25. for *works* r. *work*. l. 40. r. *defending*. p. 107. l. 40. for *material* r. *material*. p. 108. l. 38. for *add* r. *and*.

A Catalogue of the Authors and Books of Quakers, quoted in this Narrative, and some Books of their Opponents.

Great Mystery by *G. Fox* Printed 1659. *Fol.*
Saul's Errand to Damascus. By *G. F.* &c. 1653. In 4*to.*
Truths Defence. By *G. F.* and *Richard Hubberthorne* about 1654. In 4*to.*
Voice of Wisdom. By *G. W.* 1659. In 8*vo.*
The Watcher. By *J. Parnel.* In 4*to.*
A Brief Discovery of the Dangerous Principles of Jo. Horne, by *G. Whithead* 1659. in 4*to.*
Truth Defending the Quakers, by *G. Whithead,* &c. 1659. in 8*vo.*
A Brief Discovery of the Three-fold State of Antichrist, by *G. F.* &c. 1653. in 4*to.*
Doctrine of Perfection Vindicated, by *Jo. Whitehouse,* 1663. in 4*to.*
Fr. Howgil's Works. 1676. *Fol.*
Several Papers given forth, by *G. F.* 1671. in 4*to.*
W. Penn's Reason against Railing, 1673. 8*vo.*
W. Penn's Christian Quaker, 1674. *Fol.*
Appindix to Christian Quaker. 1674 *Fol.*
W. Penn's Sandy Foundation. 1668. 4*to.*
Ishmael and his Mother, by *G. W.* &c. 1655. 4*to.*
G. Whitehead's Divinity of Christ. 1669. 4*to.*
Light and Life, by *G. Whithead.* 1668. 4*to.*
Quakers Plainness, by *G. Whithead* 1674 8*vo*
Primer, by *G. F. Jun.* and *Stephen Crisp.* 1682 24*o*
Serious Apology, by *W. Penn* 1671 4*to*
W. P's Rejoinder to *Jo. Faldo* 1673 8*vo*
Rich. Hubberthorne's Collection 1663 4*to*
He Goat's Horn Broken, by *G. Whithead* 1660 4*to*
Edw. Borrough's Collection 1672 *Fol.*
W. Penn's Address to Protestants 1679 4*to*
Jacob found in a Desart Land 1656 4*to*
William Bailie's Collection 1676 4*to*
Tho. Elwood's Answer to my First Narrative 8*vo*
Truth Defended, by *T. Elwood* 8*vo*
Nature of Christianity, by *G. Whithead* 1671 4*to*
Christ Ascending above the Clouds 1669 4*to*
G. Foxe's Distinction betwixt the two Suppers 1685 4*to*

News

News out of the North, by G. Fox 1655 4to
Glory of Christ within by G. Whitehead, &c. 4to
True Faith of the Gospel of Peace, by *Ed. Burr.* 1656 4to
Some Principles of the Elect People of God, by *G. F.* 1671 4to
W. Penn's Key, *last Edition* 1699. a little 8vo
Antidote against the Snake, by *G. W.* 1697 8vo
Switch for the Snake, by *Jos. Wyeth* 1699 8vo
Truth and Innocency, by *Geo. Whitehead* 1699 4to
Judgment Fixed, by *Geo. Whitehead* 8vo
Some Account from Colchester, by *Seven Quakers* 1699 4to
G. Whitehead's Christian Epistle to Friends 1691 4to
G. Fox's Canons or Orders 1669 8vo
A Few Positions of the sincere Belief, &c. by *G. W.* &c. 1698
A Testimony for the true Christ, by the *Quakers* 1668 4to

BOOKS against the Quakers Quoted.

Quakery Slain, by *Christopher Wade* 1657 4to
His Second Book to the People called Quakers 4to
The Scornful Quaker Answered, by *Magnus Byne* 4to
A further Discovery of that Generation of Men called Quakers, by *Five Ministers of* New-Castle, 1654 4to
The Way cast up, by *Geo. Keith*, 1677 8vo

This Book was Published by him, when under the profession of a Quaker; tho' many things in it are contrary to the Quakers, particularly, the Prayer quoted in this Narrative, p. 21.